



Various groups of key stakeholders were consulted during the preparation of the Planning Obligation Strategy Supplementary Planning Document. The table below lists out the groups consulted, the means by which they were consulted and summarises their feedback and responses.

STAKEHOLDER(S)	METHOD OF CONSULTATION	COMMENTS	HOW TAKEN ON BOARD IN THE DRAFT SPD
City Council			
City Council Development Control Team	Workshop session, based around discussion on problems associated with using existing Planning Obligations Strategy 2004 SPG	<p>Generally existing SPG is easy to use. However, some problems identified with Open Space section of Strategy, in relation to applying and interpreting specific parts of the open space requirements.</p> <p>Considered that bedsits should be treated as one-person units for the purposes of calculating open space requirements.</p> <p>Public Realm section, including Public Safety and Destination Visitor Management sub-categories generally considered to be unsatisfactory and few officers had secured such</p>	<p>Open space section amended to provide more clarity.</p> <p>Bedsits specifically mentioned as one-person units for purposes of calculating open space requirements.</p> <p>Public Realm section completely redrafted and Destination Visitor Management incorporated within more general Public Realm requirements, now potentially applying to hotel uses.</p>

STAKEHOLDER(S)	METHOD OF CONSULTATION	COMMENTS	HOW TAKEN ON BOARD IN THE DRAFT SPD
		<p>planning obligations. These reasons for this were identified as follows: difficulty identifying appropriate public realm improvements, lack of understanding as to what improvements can be secured, lack of a formula for community safety and Destination Visitor Management categories, no clarity on what Visitor Destination improvements can be sought.</p>	<p>Standard formulae introduced for Public realm and Community Safety elements.</p> <p>City Council to develop a Public Realm Strategy to support the Planning Obligation Strategy SPD, which will include a list of public realm projects.</p>
<p>Roger Coey, Head of Environmental Services</p>	<p>E-Mail consultation</p>	<p>Recommended incorporation of standard charges for household waste and recycling receptacles</p>	<p>Incorporated in draft SPD</p>
<p>Jen Robertson, Waste Strategy Officer</p>	<p>E-Mail consultation and follow up meetings</p>	<p>Recommended incorporation of reference to requirement for mini underground recycling centres for large-scale developments</p>	<p>Incorporated in draft SPD</p>
<p>Debbie Kaye, Head of Active Communities</p>	<p>Series of meetings</p>	<p>Compiled new revised schedule of open space projects</p>	<p>Incorporated in draft SPD</p>
<p>Ken Hay, Head of Community Development</p>	<p>Series of meetings and telephone discussions</p>	<p>Various amendments suggested to Community Facilities section including revised list of community facilities projects</p>	<p>Incorporated in draft SPD</p>
<p>Elizabeth Rolph, Senior Planning Officer</p>	<p>Series of meetings</p>	<p>Revision of Open Space section in accordance with</p>	<p>Incorporated in draft SPD</p>

STAKEHOLDER(S)	METHOD OF CONSULTATION	COMMENTS	HOW TAKEN ON BOARD IN THE DRAFT SPD
		new Open Space standards	
Barry Louth, Transport Planning Manager	E-mail consultation	No response	No changes necessary
Eileen Oliver, Senior Transport Planner	E-Mail consultation	Suggested incorporation of standard charges for provision of bus shelters	Not considered reasonable and in accordance with Circular 05/2005. Not included in draft
Alan Wingfield, Drainage Engineer	E-Mail consultation	Suggested charges for drainage improvements	Would have to be on a site-specific basis. Reference to this included in Sections 3.9 and 4 of draft
Glen Richardson, Head of Joint Urban Design Team	E-Mail consultation and series of meetings	Revision of Public Realm section	Public Realm section completely rewritten
John Preston, Historic Environment Manager	E-mail consultation	Suggested reference to heritage and listed building improvements	Reference included in Section 3.9
David Roberts Planning Policy Manager	E-Mail consultation and follow up informal discussions	No comments	-
Members Planning Obligation Steering Group, Chaired by Cllr Tim Ward	Topic-specific meeting with round table discussion, following circulation of paper prepared by Special Projects and Implementation Manager outlining issues and options and stakeholder comments.	Considered that revised Strategy should not become over-complicated and so should not include a lot of additional standard charges. Regard was had to existing problems with finding out information in relation to expenditure of County transport monies. Not willing to support standard charges for Police or hospital services without additional information/more certainty as to	Standard charges for Police and hospital services not included in draft. Additional categories of standard charges kept to a minimum.

STAKEHOLDER(S)	METHOD OF CONSULTATION	COMMENTS	HOW TAKEN ON BOARD IN THE DRAFT SPD
		expenditure of such monies that may be secured.	
External stakeholders			
Cambridgeshire County Council, Mark Vigor	Letter of consultation	No response	-
Colin Rickard, Cambridgeshire County Council	E-Mail consultation and follow- up telephone discussions	Education section of draft updated in accordance with current County requirements	Incorporated into draft
Keith Miles, South Cambridgeshire District Council	Letter of consultation	No response	-
Stephen Catchpole, Chief Executive Cambridgeshire Horizons	Letter of consultation	Expressed concern about Review of City Planning Obligation Strategy proceeding in advance of County Council Area Corridor Transport Plan review	Timing issues discussed at two meetings with County Council transport policy team and officers from South Cambridgeshire District Council Policy team.
Colin Luscombe, Cambridgeshire Constabulary	Informal meeting	Suggested incorporation of standard charges for Police Capital and revenue requirements in accordance with new Police draft SPG, on a per dwelling basis	Not included for reasons above. Also more evidential basis required.
Ian Burns, PCT	Letter of consultation and two follow up meetings	Suggested incorporation of standard charges for provision of new and improvements to existing GP facilities on a per dwelling basis	Requirement included from residential developments, based on a threshold of 100 additional units. More evidential basis and details of proposed expenditure required for a per dwelling requirement to be included.
Cambridge University	Letter of consultation	Viability concerns expressed, impact on house prices, concerns about	No changes made to draft. Many of these concerns have either been addressed through

STAKEHOLDER(S)	METHOD OF CONSULTATION	COMMENTS	HOW TAKEN ON BOARD IN THE DRAFT SPD
		principles contained in Area Corridor Transport Plans, problems with public art category, arbitrary nature of some charges	the Local Plan process or will be considered as part of the separate Area Corridor Transport Plan review.
Roger Cutting/Stephen Graves Addenbrooke's Hospital NHS Trust	Letter of consultation	Recommended standard charges be introduced for hospital infrastructure on a per dwelling basis	No evidential basis for requirement provided. Projects for suggested expenditure not considered to be in accordance with Circular 05/2005. Hospital is a sub-regional facility and serves a wide area and such standard charges should be introduced on a sub-regional basis. No changes made to draft.
Colin Brown, Januarys	Letter of consultation	No response	-

Consultation on the draft SPD

The draft SPD and its accompanying sustainability appraisal were made available for public consultation for 6 weeks from 16th April – 29th May 2007. In line with the consultation standards set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, the consultation documents were sent to the statutory and other consultees as set out in Appendix A. In addition, the consultation material and response forms were made available at the Environment and Planning Reception in the Guildhall and were sent to public libraries. All of the consultation material was made available on the Council's website and an online consultation system was utilised to allow people to submit their comments via the internet (hard copies of the response forms were made available to those who do not have access to the internet). In addition, a notice was placed in the Cambridge Evening News containing information about the consultation and how people could get involved.

By the end of the consultation period, the Council had received a total of 448 representations, 40 in support of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, and 408 objections in objection. Respondees included the University of Cambridge, Countryside Properties, Bidwells on behalf of various clients, Addenbrooke's NHS Trust, Cambridgeshire County Council, English Heritage, Natural England, Primary Care Trust, Highways Agency and the Home Builders Federation. A number of representations were also received from individuals.

Education

During the consultation period, the City Council received a representation containing significant revisions to the education section of the SPD from Cambridgeshire County Council. As a result of these issues arising from consultation and policy-making processes, the draft SPD needed to be amended and further discussions and consultation on the education section of the SPD was required prior to adoption. In addition to this, the postholder who was previously leading on this project moved post in late 2007 and the post was not re-appointed. This led to difficulties in finalising the rest of the POS SPD. However, the Council appointed Scott Wilson in 2009 as external consultants to complete the process including the education section.

Since then, a number of discussions have taken place with the County Council regarding the education contributions and a report was taken to Development Plan Steering Group on 1st December 2009. Discussions are still ongoing and further progress will be reported to Development Plan Steering prior to undertaking any further consultation.

In the meantime, the education section in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy will continue to apply until its superseded by the revised education section. It is anticipated that the education issues can be resolved (including undertaking any necessary consultation) over the next few months, with adoption of this section of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD in July 2010.

Key Issues raised through Consultation

Officers have worked through all representations received. Appendix B provides summaries of all representations and proposed responses. The main issues raised by respondents can be summarised as follows:

General Comments

- Fundamental concerns expressed about extent of planning obligations being sought and question whether the requirements go beyond the tests set out in Circular 05/2005. If agreed in its current form, the SPD would set significant precedents that go beyond what is reasonable.
- More flexibility required to reflect the fact that each planning application is different and subject to differing complexities and impacts.
- SPD should be delayed until Government's intentions in relation to Planning Gain Supplement have been confirmed.
- Opportunity should have been taken to introduce a single cross-boundary SPD.
- General concern expressed about lack of detailed evidence to support thresholds and financial formulae set out in SPD.
- All SPDs should be prepared at the same time.
- More reference to cross-boundary contributions required.
- All thresholds for application of planning obligation requirements should be the same.
- Elements of the SPD need to be updated to reflect current thinking.

Section 3: Methodology

- Strong argument for the inclusion of archaeology and the historic environment in the Strategy.

Section 3.1: Affordable Housing

- The Affordable Housing SPD should be published at the same time as the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.
- Concerns of duplication between this SPD and the Affordable Housing SPD
- SPD should clearly state that the mix of affordable housing can also be subject to viability testing.
- Not clear where phasing and mechanisms for delivery of affordable housing in the Areas of Major Change will be set out.

Section 3.2: Transport

- Section needs to be updated with regards to the guidance documents it refers to, particularly in light in the change of thinking on sustainable modes of transport since the publication of PPG13.
- Needs to be clearer on the status of the Corridor Area Transport Plans and the fact that these are currently under review.
- Methodology for calculating contributions is not clear.

Section 3.3: Open Space and Recreation

- 12 year maintenance funding requirement is too long –should be changed to no more than 10 years.
- Rights of Way issues should be addressed either in Open Space or Transport section of draft SPD.
- Projects listed in Appendix A of the SPD are not supported by empirical evidence.
- Additional projects should be included in schedule of strategic open space projects in Appendix B of the SPD.
- Appendix B (open space project list) of the SPD- various comments about specific projects on the list, with particular objection to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground projects.
- Method of calculating population is crude and will not reflect population accurately. For developments with a large number of single person households, the number of people and therefore the amount of open space is likely to be over provided. Should be amended to better reflect resident population.
- Strategic open space requirement should be deleted as is not included as part of Local Plan so is trying to introduce an additional policy through the SPD.
- Queries over the source/justification and accuracy of data presented in Table 1 and Appendix C of the SPD.
- Concern that the use of planning contributions in relation to existing open space is not in line with the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.
- Concern that requiring NHS providers to contribute towards open space would reduce the amount of money available for healthcare.
- Non-residential development should not be required to provide contributions towards the provision of open space.

Section 3.5: Community Facilities

- Definition of what constitutes a community facility is not clear.
- NHS providers should not be required to contribute towards planning obligations requirements for provision of infrastructure such as open space and education and SCATP.
- Contribution should be secured towards the provision and funding of secondary health care i.e. hospital services.

- Threshold of 100 residential units for consideration to be given to provision of on-site community facilities should be deleted – requirements should be reviewed on a site-by-site basis.
- Threshold of 100 units for consideration to be given to contributions towards provision of primary health care provision should be deleted – should be changed to a basis of population numbers and should take into account percentage of new residents in a development that may already be included on a GP's list and should therefore be discounted when assessing any impact on GP facilities within the local area.
- Total affordable housing schemes should not be exempt from community facilities contributions and there is little justification given for why this should be the case.
- More evidence required for contributions requirements.
- Health care requirements fail to take account of quantity and quality of actual existing provision within the areas being developed.
- Use of planning contributions to improve existing facilities is not in accordance with the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.

Section 3.6: Waste

- Waste requirements should not replace Council's statutory duties as a waste collection authority.
- Concern that requiring NHS providers to contribute towards waste would reduce the amount of money available for healthcare.
- Cost per flat of a Eurobin would appear to purchase significantly more bins than would be required for a development.
- Burden of providing mini recycling centres should not fall on one developer in terms of either cost or provision of land.
- No justification has been provided to explain the scale of contribution being sought.

Section 3.7: Public Realm

- Consideration should be given to the allocation of public realm contributions towards public realm improvements on the Addenbrooke's site.
- Concern that there is an overlap between the requirements for the public realm and those for public art and transport.
- The threshold of 20 units for public safety/public realm contributions should be deleted – should be determined on a site-by-site basis.
- The level of financial contributions being sought for public realm / public safety are too high.
- No justification for public realm requirements.
- Methodology for applying public realm requirements needs to be reconsidered.
- Schedule of public realm projects for expenditure of S106 public realm monies should be identified and contained in a public document.

Section 3.8: Public Art

- Concern that requiring NHS providers to contribute towards public art would reduce the amount of money available for healthcare.
- Seeking a contribution towards public art on the basis of development value should not be used to indicate the quality of the public art provided.
- There is no justification for the level of public art contribution being sought or the trigger point at which the requirement for public art would apply.

Section 3.9: Other Potential Development-Specific Requirements

- Need to take a more strategic approach to SuDS.

Section 4: Areas of Major Change

- No clarity in SPD as to which planning objectives are likely to be given priority for the major development areas. Without prioritisation there is likely to be considerable debate as part of the S106 processes on what community infrastructure should be provided, when it becomes evident that not all of the financial expectations can be met.

Other

- Contributions towards monitoring of planning obligations cannot be justified.
- Planning application fees should be sufficient to cover the cost of administering and monitoring S106 agreements, without any additional charge.
- Local authorities should pay their own legal costs on S106 agreements, rather than the developer being required to pay them.
- More reference needed as to how unspent monies will be remitted back to the developer.
- Archaeology issues should be addressed in detail in the SPD.
- Monitoring charges are excessive.
- Should be more reference to Police and emergency services requirements.

Summary of Proposed Changes

The main changes to the SPD in response to the representations received are summarised below. Changes have also been made as a result of the time elapse from the consultation in 2007. However, these changes are not significant and relate to necessary factual and financial updates.

General Changes

- All sections of the Strategy have been updated to take into account recent relevant Central Government guidance including Circular 05/2005 and other best practice guidance, as well as the provisions of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and any other relevant Regional and Sub-Regional guidance.

Section 3.1: Affordable Housing

- This section has been removed from the SPD in light of the information contained within the adopted Affordable Housing SPD.

Section 3.2: Transport

- This section has been updated to clarify the status of the Corridor Area Transport Plans and the fact that they are currently under review.
- Amend the SPD to include reference to the whole package of smarter choice measures as set out in the DfT publication "Smarter Choices – Changing the way we travel".

Section 3.3: Open Space and Recreation

- All references to strategic open space have been deleted as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.

- The City Council's "Open Space Standards – Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation" will be updated in line with the requirements of the POS SPD (Appendix 6).
- Table 2 will be revised to replicate Table 2 "Application of the Standards" in Appendix A of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Section 3.5: Community Facilities

- In order to avoid double counting, reference to provision for education and life-long learning within the community facilities section has been removed, as it is included within the Sub-section 3.4 (Education) of the SPD.
- Due to the time elapsed, the list of identified community facilities projects has been deleted and the SPD has been amended to explain how community facility projects are identified and the agreement process that is followed including Member approval.
- No change has been made in relation to primary health care provision. Through the consultation process, the PCT requested that a standard charge is introduced for a lower threshold. The draft POS makes provision for addressing the need for new or improved primary healthcare provision arising from residential developments comprising 100 or more units. However, it is not considered that there is sufficient information available to address this request at this stage. Relevant evidence based to justify primary care health provision on a citywide basis should be picked up through the Infrastructure Study that the City and South Cambridgeshire are currently commissioning and any change in approach can be taken forward through future work including the Community Infrastructure Levy.

NOTE: The PCT have provided some further information to justify the current threshold included in the draft Planning Obligations Strategy and officers are currently working through this information. Any issues will be flagged up the Executive Councillor for Climate Change & Growth prior to the final committee report deadline.

- In the case of amending the POS SPD to include reference to seeking contributions to hospital infrastructure provision/improvements, it is not considered that this is a feasible option at the present time. This is on the basis that Addenbrooke's hospital is a sub-regional facility and therefore it is considered that any standard charge relating to the funding of hospital infrastructure would need to be introduced as part of a wider sub-regional strategy, such as the Variable Rate Tariff and the Community Infrastructure Levy. In addition, there is a lack of detailed information available regarding the nature of the facilities/infrastructure that such contributions would fund and whether these would be a legitimate use for Section 106 contribution, in accordance with the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.

Section 3.6: Waste

- SPD has been amended to reflect the changes in costs for bins and recycling boxes since the consultation on the draft SPD.

Section 3.7: Public Realm

- This section has been deleted from the SPD as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.

Section 3.8: Public Art

- This section has been deleted from the SPD as the Public Art SPD has now been adopted and should be referred to in relation to planning contribution requirements.

Section 3.9: Other Potential Development-Specific Requirements

- Reference to impacts on the historic environment has been included in the SPD.

Section 4: Areas of Major Change

- Text has been added to clarify the status of the SPD in negotiating planning contributions.

Appendix B

- Appendix B has been removed from the SPD as the list of projects are now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in Appendix A.

Appendix C

- All references to strategic open space have been deleted as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document. The Inspectors did not find the evidence base a robust and credible enough basis for supporting policy.

The Sustainability Appraisal

In accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 200 (as updated by the Planning Act 2008), the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). This is to ascertain the document's impacts on economic, social and environmental objectives, the three elements of sustainable development. In accordance with European law, the SA process also incorporated the requirements of the 'SEA Directive'.

The principles of sustainable development are at the heart of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. The SPD seeks to identify the potential impacts of new development on the physical and social infrastructure of the City and to mitigate the identified impacts of new development through adopting a sustainable approach to the expenditure of any contributions received, for example through supporting measures to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport.

Overall, the SPD objectives performed well against all of the SA Objectives. In particular, a significant positive impact was noted against Objective 19 (to reduce waste/encourage recycling). There was no waste category in either the 2002 or 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy SPGs. The incorporation of a new waste category in the new Planning Obligations Strategy SPD will therefore have a significant positive impact on increasing the importance of waste issues in the negotiation process. More importantly it will greatly enhance the Council's ability to secure funding for receptacles and facilities to encourage waste reduction and recycling.

The appraisal of the SPD also considered the option of not producing an SPD. Not having an SPD is not a realistic option, given that the Council is already committed to producing it as part of the Local Development Scheme. However, the main effects of not having the SPD are considered below:

- Without the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, you would still have the policies to which the SPD relates that set out the likely types infrastructure for which new

developments would generate increased demand or where there may be an impact requiring mitigation. However, there would be no clear overall framework or guidance for developers to understand how the infrastructure issues relating to their development proposals will be assessed, nor information on the likely costs related to mitigating the impacts of their proposals on infrastructure resulting in a lack of certainty for developers.

- If all S106 obligations were negotiated on an ad-hoc basis, there would be an increased risk of inconsistency and that the contributions provided by developers to mitigate the impact of their development would not cover the true cost of providing appropriate infrastructure.
- There would be no agreed framework of infrastructure projects for funding using planning obligation contributions, nor any method of comprehensively combining contributions arising from individual developments to enable them to be used to implement larger more expensive items of infrastructure.
- As a result of having the Planning Obligations Strategy in place, the City Council has been significantly more successful than many other local authorities in using planning obligations as a means of securing improvements to and provision of new infrastructure. The effectiveness of having formal detailed guidance on use of planning obligations in place is supported by a number of recent studies/best practice guidance commissioned by Central Government, including Valuing Planning Obligations in England 2005 and Planning Obligations: Practice Guidance 2006. To move away from this approach would therefore be contrary to recent Central Government advice.
- Circular 05/2005 recommends that detailed policies applying the principles of policies e.g. standard formulae/ charges should be contained in SPDs. Not to have an SPD would mean that the Council would not be able to rely on a system of agreed standard charges and would therefore have to adopt a more ad-hoc approach. This would be likely to result in greater inconsistency and would appear to be moving away from the approach advocated by Circular 05/2005.
- The Council would be unable to rely on the Planning Obligation Strategy 2004 SPG in the long-term, given that it is associated with the Cambridge Local Plan 1996, now superseded and will become increasingly out of date over time. Its weight will be therefore reduced, leaving the Council more open to a potential legal challenge.

The SA process also identified a number of uncertainties and risks surrounding the SPD. The main concerns are:

- Insufficient resources are put in place to monitor the significant effects of the SPD; and
- The introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy will have a significant impact on the existing planning obligation regime and there is currently still a high degree of uncertainty as to the level of funding that local authorities will be able to secure through the Levy in relation to provision of strategic infrastructure provision.

As previously mentioned, the Council received a total of 448 of representations, 40 in support of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD and 408 in objection. One representation was also received to the draft SA Report. This representation was concerned with the historic environment indicators used within the Sustainability Appraisal Framework. While it was agreed that the indicators used for the historic environment were not ideal, it was felt that the refinement of indicators is more suited to Stage A of the Sustainability Appraisal process, i.e. the production of the Scoping Report. As a result of the objections made to the draft SPD, a number of changes have been made to the document, although the objectives of the SPD, which formed the basis for this Sustainability Appraisal, have not been changed. Accordingly, the SA has been reviewed

in order to assess the significance of these changes, as set out in the table below. It should be noted that this table does not include changes that were made to the SPD in order to ensure that it referred to the most up to date guidance documents and policy context or changes to clarify elements of the SPD, as such changes do not materially alter the objectives and aims of the SPD.

Appraisal of the significance of changes to the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD

NATURE OF CHANGE TO THE SPD	ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	CHANGE TO SA
Section 3.1: Affordable Housing – removal of section from the SPD	<p>This section has been removed from the SPD in light of the information contained within the adopted Affordable Housing SPD and the need to avoid duplication and repetition between documents. Reference to the need to refer to the Affordable Housing SPD has been added to the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.</p> <p>With regards to the significance of this change on the Sustainability Appraisal, it is considered that this change is not significant, as it does not materially alter the aims and objectives of the SPD. The adopted Affordable Housing SPD has undergone a full Sustainability Appraisal, the conclusions of which were that the SPD would have generally positive impacts on the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives.</p>	None required
Removal of References to Strategic Open Space throughout the document	<p>All references to strategic open space have been deleted as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document. To include reference to strategic open space within the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD would have led to conflict with the 'tests of soundness' for planning documents, and while SPDs do not undergo examination, they still need to be prepared with these tests in mind.</p> <p>With regards to the significance of this change on the Sustainability Appraisal, it is considered that this change is not significant, as it does not materially alter the aims and objectives of the SPD. Contributions will still be sought for open space provision on a site-by-site basis and should the evidence base for strategic open space requirements be strengthened, the Planning Obligations Strategy does not necessarily preclude contributions being sought in the future.</p>	None required
Section 3.7: Public Realm – removal of the	This section has been deleted from the SPD as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	None required

NATURE OF CHANGE TO THE SPD	ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	CHANGE TO SA
section from the SPD	<p>With regards to the significance of this change on the Sustainability Appraisal, it is considered that this change is not significant, as it does not materially alter the aims of objectives of the SPD. Reference to the potential for contributions towards public realm improvements to be sought has been added to the section of the SPD covering 'Other Potential Development-Specific Requirements'. The need for public realm improvements will be determined on a site-by-site basis and the SPD provides the framework for such negotiations.</p>	
Section 3.8: Public Art – removal of the section from the SPD	<p>This section has been deleted from the SPD as the Public Art SPD has now been adopted and should be referred to in relation to planning contribution requirements. This will help to avoid duplication and repetition between documents. Reference to the need to refer to the Public Art SPD has been added to the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.</p> <p>With regards to the significance of this change on the Sustainability Appraisal, it is considered that this change is not significant, as it does not materially alter the aims and objectives of the SPD. The adopted Public Art SPD has undergone a full Sustainability Appraisal, the conclusions of which were that the SPD would have generally positive impacts on the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives.</p>	None required
Appendix B: List of Open Space and Recreation Projects Proposed for Funding – deletion of Appendix	<p>Appendix B has been removed from the SPD as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in Appendix A.</p> <p>With regards to the significance of this change on the Sustainability Appraisal, it is considered that this change is not significant, as it does not materially alter the aims and objectives of the SPD. Contributions will still be sought for open space and recreation projects on a site-by-site basis.</p>	None required

On assessing the changes to the SPD, it was felt that as none of them materially alter the aims and objectives of the Planning Obligations Strategy. Many of these changes involved the removal of sections that were dealt with in other adopted Supplementary Planning Documents, all of which have undergone Sustainability Appraisal. As such, it has been concluded that the changes to the SPD do not materially alter the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal.

The final SPD and its accompanying Sustainability Appraisal will be made available on the City Council's website on adoption.

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

Tel: 01223 457200

Fax: 01223 457109

Email: policysurveys@cambridge.gov.uk

Appendix A: Schedule of Consultees for the draft SPD

Statutory Consultees:

Coton Parish Council
Fen Ditton Parish Council
Fulbourn Parish Council
Girton Parish Council
Grantchester Parish Council
Great Shelford Parish Council
Histon & Impington Parish Councils
Horningsea Parish Council
Maddingley Parish Council
Milton Parish Council
Teversham Parish Council
GO-East
Highways Agency
South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cambridgeshire County Council
East of England Regional Assembly
Natural England
The Countryside Agency - East of England Region
English Heritage
Network Rail
Environment Agency
East of England Development Agency
The Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority
Anglian Water Services
Cambridge Water Company
Cambridgeshire Horizons

General Consultees

Local Strategic Partnership
Residents Associations
42 x City Councillors
Ward County Councillors
Stagecoach in Cambridge
The CamToo Project
Conservators of the River Cam
Transport 2000
Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Cambridge Preservation Society
Cam Valley Forum
Business Groups
Cambridgeshire Chamber of Commerce
Business Link for Cambridgeshire
The Home Builders Federation
Confederation of British Industry
Institute of Directors - Cambridgeshire Branch
Marshalls of Cambridge
Cambridge Chamber of Commerce

Sport England East
East of England Tourist Board
Arts Council England East
National Playing Fields Association
The Theatres Trust
Cambridge Sustainable City Reference Group
Cambridge City Council Conservation & Design Panel
The Wildlife Trust
Shape Cambridge
Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum
Biodiversity Partnership for Cambridgeshire & Peterborough
University of Cambridge Estates Management and Building Service
Terrence O'Rourke,
Trumpington Meadows Land Company
Defence Estates East
The Crown Estate Office
The Federation of Master Builders
Bidwells
Ashwell Developments
Liberty Property Trust UK Ltd
Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation
David Wilson Homes
Grovesnor
Countryside Properties
Eversheds LLP
Turnstone Estates
Januarys
Reedham Homes
Laing Homes
Unex Technical Services
Hill Residential
Smith Stuart Reynolds
Carter Jonas
Barratts
Miller Homes
Ross River Ltd
Persimmon
Crest Nicholson
Waites
Highland Homes
Bellway Homes
Gallagher Estates
Hepher Dixon
The Housing Corporation, Eastern Region
Head of Development, Cambridge Housing Society
Head of Development and New Business, Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association
Head of Business Growth Circle Anglia
English Partnerships
Granta Housing Society
King Street Housing
Hundred Houses Society

National Housing Federation
Flagship (The Cambridge Housing Society)
Nene Housing Society
Places for People
Hereward Housing
Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Public Health Network
Cambridgeshire Horizons Health Forum
Anglia Ruskin University
Cambridge Regional College
Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge
University of Cambridge
Learning and Skills Council Cambridgeshire
Cambridge Inter-Faith Group
East of England Faiths Agency
East of England Faiths Council
Disability Rights Commission
Commission for Racial Equality
Equal Opportunities Commission for England
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
The East Anglian Gypsy Council
Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum (CECF)
Minority Ethnic Network of the Eastern Region (MENTER)
Cambridgeshire Race Equality & Diversity Service
Cambridge City Council Disability Panel
Cambridge Forum of Disabled People
Cambridgeshire Deaf Association
Cambridgeshire Learning Disability Partnership
Camsight
CAMTAD (Campaign for Tackling Acquired Deafness)
Cambridge Hard of Hearing Club
Cambridge Disabled Transport Group
Cambridge Organisation Promoting Disability Awareness
Changing Directions
Cambridge Disability Equality Project
Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service
Council of St Johns Ambulance Cambridgeshire

Appendix B: Summary of Representations and Responses

Planning Obligation Strategy SPD

Public Participation Report

1. Introduction and Purpose and Key Aims of the Strategy

1.1

Representations

Nature Summary of Main Issue

Council's Assessment

Action

1. Introduction and Purpose and Key Aims of the Strategy

1.1

1296 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]

Object

The County Council proposes that all the contributions quoted need to be index linked in agreements from April 2007 to ensure that they keep pace with future inflation.

Concern noted. The issue of indexing will be clarified in paragraph 6.3 by the inclusion of a new final sentence, which reads:
"Generally contributions will be linked to current Royal Institute Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Building Construction Information Service (BCIS), but other indexes may be used upon agreement with the Council, if it can be demonstrated they are most closely aligned to the type of works."

Add new sentence to paragraph 6.3 to read:
"Generally contributions will be linked to current Royal Institute Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Building Construction Information Service (BCIS), but other indexes may be used upon agreement with the Council, if it can be demonstrated they are most closely aligned to the type of works."

1145 - king street housing society (Mr colin wiles) [411]

Object

We object because this is a tax on affordable housing providers like ourselves. It means we can produce fewer affordable dwellings - surely a case of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing, since the costs will ultimately come from public funds. If Cambridge is growing, the infrastructure should be funded from increased council tax revenues and NOT from a tax on development. This is a political fix that allows politicians to suppress council tax rises.

Concerns noted. The Council recognises the challenges faced in delivering affordable housing. Whilst there are exemptions within the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD for total affordable housing schemes, it must be noted that the delivery of further housing units, regardless of tenure, will have an impact that will need to be mitigated.

1.3

1471 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]

Object

The Trust recognises that the development of the 2020 Vision will increase the number of people travelling to the site. The Trust however objects to the reference in paragraph 1.3 that this development will "add significantly to the congestion". The 2020 Vision and other development within the s Fringe will be committing significant sums of funding to relieve congestion, through contributions to the new Addenbrooke's Access road, to the Cambridge Guided Bus scheme and other transport schemes to improve service for the residents of Cambridge.

Concern noted, however the cumulative impact of development at the Southern Fringe and on other growth sites will inevitably lead to an increasing number of journeys to Addenbrooke's and other attractors. However, we recognise that these impacts can be mitigated and will amend the third sentence of paragraph 1.3 as follows:
"New commercial development, and particularly large-scale developments such as Addenbrooke's 20/20 will increase the number of people travelling into and around the City and without appropriate mitigation may significantly add to congestion and pressure on public transport, car and cycle parking and public safety."

Amend the third sentence of paragraph 1.3 as follows:
"New commercial development, and particularly large-scale developments such as Addenbrooke's 20/20 will increase the number of people travelling into and around the City and without appropriate mitigation may significantly add to congestion and pressure on public transport, car and cycle parking and public safety."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1297 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	The Council makes a sweeping statement in this paragraph that implies that all proposed developments will have a negative impact. This paragraph should therefore be amended.	Concern noted, however the cumulative impact of development will lead to an increase in demand for physical and social infrastructure in the City that will require mitigation. Such an approach is in accordance with the provisions of Circular 5/05. As such no changes to the paragraph are considered necessary.	
1205 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Object - "new residential development will increase demand for school places and community facilities" etc [our emphasis]. Residential development will not necessarily increase on education or community infrastructure and this should be assessed on a site by site basis. It should not automatically be assumed that all residential development will have such an impact. The word 'will' should be replaced by 'may'.	Concern noted, however the cumulative impact of development will lead to an increase in demand for education and community infrastructure and as such the proposed wording is not considered to be appropriate.	
1325 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	<p>The University acknowledges that substantial investment is required in the City and the Cambridge sub-region, both to improve the existing infrastructure and to mitigate the impact of future development, if the vision for the City and the sub region is to be delivered.</p> <p>Circular 5/2005 makes it clear however that the requirement for any planning obligation should be directly related in scale to the impact of the proposed development and should not be used to address existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision. These existing deficiencies need to be tackled vigorously by the public authorities at central, regional, sub-regional and local level.</p>	Concern noted. The aim of the Planning Obligation Strategy SPD is to address the adverse impact of developments taking into account the scale of the impact of the proposed development.	
<i>1.4</i>				
1269 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	In the second line of paragraph 1.4, the County Council recommend deleting the word "important" and substituting "essential" to give added weight to infrastructure need. Without improved infrastructure much of the planned development will not be able to take place or will be unsustainable in terms of over-loading existing systems and facilities.	Concern noted. The provision of infrastructure is an important element of sustainable development, although it is not the only feature. As written, it is felt that the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD strikes the right balance of highlighting the importance of infrastructure provision while reflecting that there is some flexibility in its delivery.	
1327 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	There remains considerable concern that the scale of potential planning obligation requirements may threaten either the viability of development within the sub-region and discourage the bringing forward of land for development or alternatively have an inflationary impact on, for example, house prices as developers seek to recoup the cost of any planning obligations. These concerns are heightened by	Concern noted. The Planning Obligations SPD will provide the basis for negotiations on individual planning applications. While the impact on viability is an important consideration in the determination of planning contributions, relaxation of the requirements stated in this SPD will need to be agreed with the Council where specific information pertaining to the impact on the viability of development can	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		the introduction of a range of potential additional obligations in the new strategy.	be provided by the developer.	
<i>1.5</i>				
1371 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	1.2 It is noted that it is the intention of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to provide a framework for the application planning obligation requirements and the expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligation agreements. We do, however, have fundamental concerns about the extent of the planning obligations being sought and would question whether the requirements go beyond the tests given in Circular 05/2005. If agreed in its current form the SPD would set significant precedents which go beyond what is reasonable.	Concern noted. The Planning Obligations SPD will provide the basis for negotiations on individual planning applications. While the impact on viability is an important consideration in the determination of planning contributions, relaxation of the requirements stated in this SPD will need to be agreed with the Council where specific information pertaining to the impact on the viability of development can be provided by the developer.	
1324 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	<p>As you are aware we have previously expressed concern at the timing of the bringing forward of this new strategy, given the possibility of significant changes to the current planning obligation system arising from the Governments on-going review and the likelihood of the need for a further, and possibly more fundamental, review of any new strategy at an early date.</p> <p>It seems unfortunate, too, that given that many of the urban extensions, including North West Cambridge, cross Local Authority boundaries, that the opportunity has been missed to have adopted a cross boundary approach to the development of the new Strategy.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD will be revised to make reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), while at the same time making it clear the CIL remains outside the scope of this SPD.</p> <p>With regards to the negotiation of planning obligations for the urban extensions, these are being dealt with on a site by site basis. For some elements of contributions, further work has been undertaken to inform negotiations. Section 4 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the process for dealing with the urban extensions and will provide the basis for further negotiations.</p>	<p>Add a new paragraph after 1.5 to read:</p> <p>"1.6 Part II of the 2008 Planning Act provides for the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Local authorities will be empowered, but not required, to charge a CIL on most types of new development in their area. Local authorities can choose the CIL rate that they wish to set, but must set this out in a new legal document (a 'charging schedule') which is independently examined to ensure that it is evidence-based and appropriate for the local area. The levy will be based on a formula which relate the size of the charge to the size and character of the development paying it. The proceeds of CIL will be spent on local and sub-regional infrastructure to support the development of an area. However, this will not replace the need for mainstream public funding. The Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 were laid before the House of commons on 10 February 2010 and will, subject to</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1298 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	The Council should recognise within this paragraph that any planning obligation should meet the 5 tests set out in Paragraph B5 of Circular 05/2005.	Concern noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD has been drafted in accordance with the requirements set out in Circular 05/2005. As paragraph 1.5 makes specific reference to this Circular it is felt that no changes to the SPD are required.	approval by MP's, come into force on 6th April 2010. CIL remains outside the scope of the Planning Obligations Strategy, but will be considered in relation to work on the Core Strategy and relevant local and Sub-regional Infrastructure studies.
<i>1.6</i>				
1206 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The review of all documents should be carried out at the same time to allow for certainty in the development process. By carrying out the review of all documents separately the implementation of the Planning Obligations Strategy is jeopardised.	Concern noted. However, it is not always possible to review and update documents at the same time. Indeed, it may not always be necessary to review these documents at the same time. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD provides the basis for the Area Corridor Transport Plans to be used in the negotiation of planning contributions. The Area Corridor Transport Plans are currently being reviewed by Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highways Authority and once adopted will form companion guides to the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.	
<i>1.8</i>				
1482 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) (Dr H Kamminga) [472]	Object	S106 moneys should be spent strictly on projects that add new amenities to the City, and not for repair and maintenance of existing amenities.	Concern noted. The intention of the Planning Obligations Strategy is to mitigate for the impacts of new development. Various forms of mitigation may be required including the provision of new facilities. However with some developments it may not be possible to meet mitigation requirements on-site, and in these situations it may be more appropriate to use S106 monies to improve existing facilities.	
1372 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	1.3 As currently drafted the document is too dense and the relevant information is inaccessible to the reader. The overall presentation is poor and the strategy correspondingly lacks sufficient clarity. In our opinion it would be more appropriate to provide a general commentary upon the need for additional community infrastructure on a subject by subject basis and then focus upon the methodology for the calculation of the appropriate contributions. The planning policy summaries contained	Concern noted. A significant amount of information is contained within the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD and the methodology has been split into subject categories. It is felt that the planning policy summaries contained at the start of each section provide a useful context for each topic, and this would be lost if they were moved to an appendix. While minor changes will be made to the layout of the document in terms of paragraph numbering and section headings, it is felt that no further changes are necessary.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		within Section 3 would be better placed in an annex since they only provide contextual information. The summary table provided on pages 17 and 18 is sufficient.		
1207 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	In applying the main purposes of the POS SPD must all be reasonably related to the development to which it related and therefore should follow the tests in Circular 05/2005. The first bullet point should be revised to read: "new infrastructure or improvements to existing infrastructure". This should be amended to provide clarity in the application of the purpose of the SPD.	Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD has been drafted in accordance with the requirements set out in Circular 05/2005. It is felt that the SPD as drafted in sufficiently clear and that the suggested amendment does not add any further clarification to the text.	
1663 - South Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Jonathan Dixon) [502]	Object	The SPD should provide a framework to address a wide variety of planning applications, including those that require cross boundary provision of infrastructure. There will be occasions where a development in the City generates a need for infrastructure improvements in South Cambridgeshire. There are a number of references in the SPD to planning obligations addressing impact on the City. It may be more sound to refer to 'the City and where appropriate the surrounding area'.	Concern noted. Cross boundary provision is recognised in section 4 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, which deals with requirements for the Areas of Major Change. However, it is felt that it would also be useful to make specific reference to the need for cross boundary provision of infrastructure where appropriate and there is a direct impact from the development.	Amend the third bullet point of paragraph 1.8 to read: "addressing the needs identified to accommodate the projected growth of Cambridge and, where appropriate, the surrounding area".
1524 - Cambridgeshire PCT (Mr Ian Burns) [917]	Support	Overall, we feel this is an important Supplementary Planning Document particularly in view of the amount of development planned for Cambridge in the next few years. The provision of appropriate infrastructure and services is vital in order to both create new healthy and sustainable communities and also to mitigate the impacts of new developments on the existing communities.	Support noted.	
1160 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	The purpose of the document is consistent with the Proposed Changes in that it contributes to sustainable development.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>1.9</i>				
1644 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) Limited [243]	Object	<p>The SPD is drafted on the basis that contributions are paid on implementation of planning permission; see paragraph 3.2.18 in relation to transport contributions. We object to this approach on the basis that it is inflexible and does not reflect the provisions of Circular 05/05. Specifically the Circular highlights at paragraph B17 that payments can be made in a lump sum, phased payments over a period of time, related to defined dates, events and triggers.</p> <p>In our view the appropriate trigger should be determined on a site-by-site basis having regard to development costs, when the impact arises and the time needed to implement the mitigation measure. The later point is especially important in respect of pooled contributions, as there should not be a requirement to pay monies upfront where the mitigation/infrastructure will not be commenced for a notable period pending receipt of all monies required.</p>	<p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD has been drafted in accordance with Circular 05/2005 to provide a framework against which planning contributions will be negotiated on a site by site basis. Paragraph 1.10 makes it clear that the the Council will consider the circumstances of each site in line with the tests set out in Circular 05/2005. However, for clarity, a further paragraph will be added to the Planning Obligations Strategy.</p>	<p>Add new paragraph after para 1.11 to read:</p> <p>"For outline applications, where the number of units is not specified, contributions will be based on the number of dwellings in the indicative layout, or agreed with the Council, provided this number complies with the Local Plan policy 5/10 on dwelling mix and strategic mix set out in the Affordable Housing SPD, when relevant. In some cases, the impacts and how contributions may mitigate them are less predictable and can only be established through site specific investigation and negotiation. Where the precise level of development in an outline permission requires subsequent approval, the obligation will include clauses allowing for a proportionate increase in the scale of contributions and specify an agreed formulae to calculate this additional element, and appropriate triggers will be agreed on a site by site basis."</p>
1209 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	<p>Ashwell welcome the objectives of the SPD in providing clarity and a comprehensive/streamlined approach to S106 agreements.</p> <p>The second bullet point should be revised. While the SPD should indeed supplement the policies in the development plan by providing clarity however, the SPD should not introduce new policy that should be properly included in the Local Plan or equivalent.</p>	<p>Support for the objectives of the SPD noted. With regards to the concern that the SPD is introducing new policy, this is not the case. The second bullet point merely seeks to clarify that the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD supplements the policies and proposals set out in the development plan for Cambridge, which have been subject to independent examination.</p>	
1328 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	<p>For the reasons given above, the University believes that academic or research related developments, which will deliver the City's declared vision for Cambridge as a centre of excellence and world leader in the field of higher education and research, should be exempt from planning obligation requirements.</p>	<p>Concern noted. However there are many types of development that contribute towards meeting the City's vision. Academic and research related developments will still have some impact, for example, trip generation, which will need mitigation. The exact planning obligations requirements will be negotiated on a case by case basis. To exempt such development from planning obligation</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			requirements would be contrary to Circular 05/2005.	
<i>1.10</i>				
1635 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) Limited [243]	Object	<p>It is noted that paragraph 1.10 of the above document states that the SPD will provide a starting point for negotiations on planning obligations that will take into account site circumstances and the tests set out in Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations. Indeed, this approach is consistent with the provisions of B35 of the Circular which highlights that standard charges and formulae should reflect actual impacts of the development and should comply with the tests set out in the Circular.</p> <p>Our concern in respect of the above is that the remaining SPD is not worded to follow this sentiment and implies that all developments that meet the specified triggers will be required to contribute the precise sums identified. The SPD should provide a clearer commitment that the provisions of the SPD will not be applied on a blanket basis.</p>	Concern noted. The Planning Obligations SPD will provide the basis for negotiations on individual planning applications. While the impact on viability is an important consideration in the determination of planning contributions, relaxation of the requirements stated in this SPD will need to be agreed with the Council where specific information pertaining to the impact on the viability of development can be provided by the developer. As the Planning Obligations Strategy should be read as a whole, and given the information provided in paragraph 1.10 pertaining to negotiations on a site by site basis, it is felt that further clarification is unnecessary.	
1299 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	The Council should recognise that development is not necessarily a 'bad' thing that causes negative impacts.	Concern noted, although it is felt that this is not the impression put across by the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. Paragraph 1.10 of the SPD merely recognises that the extent of impacts requiring mitigation will vary on a site by site basis. Failure to mitigate these impacts would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 05/2005.	
<i>1.11</i>				
1210 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Any additional S106 contributions (development specific) not included in the POS SPD should also be set out in the context of the tests set out in Circular 05/2005. This should be made clear in this paragraph.	Concern noted. Any additional contributions will be in line with the requirements of Circular 05/2005. However, it is felt that sufficient reference to the need for compliance with this circular is made in the preceding paragraphs and that the SPD should be read as a whole. As such it is felt that additional reference to Circular 05/2005 is unnecessary.	

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****Council's Assessment****Action****2. Planning Context****2.3**

1326 - University of Cambridge
(Mr Michael Bienias) [364]

Object

There is clearly an obligation on developers to mitigate the impact of new development and to contribute to the provision of infrastructure in respect of that development. Planning Obligations must, however, be directly related to the development proposed and only sought where they meet all the five 'tests' set out in Circular 05/2005.

The University is concerned that some proposed obligations set out in the strategy do not meet all of these tests.

Concerns noted. However, it is the Council's view that the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is in accordance with Circular 05/2005.

2.6

1636 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern)
Limited [243]

Object

Whilst the Circular accepts the use of formulae and standard charges, we would object to the detailed provisions of the SPD in respect of the method of calculation, the amount of monies sought and the double counting of contributions.

Concerns noted. The Council has amended the double-counting present in the education and community facilities chapters. Paragraph 3.5.1 of the community facilities chapter notes that the provision of education and library facilities is dealt with in Section 3.4 on education.

Amend paragraph 3.5.1 to insert a second sentence to read "Education and library provision is dealt with in Section 3.4 of this document and, as such, any monies collected towards community facilities will not be used for the provision of education or library facilities."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
2.9				
1211 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	If the Planning Gain Supplement is introduced then the POS SPD should be reviewed as a matter of priority. This should suitably scale back the requirements of the SPD in light of the requirements of PGS. An undertaking should be made in the SPD to implement that review if an announcement is made about the implementation of PGS.	Concerns noted. Whilst Planning Gain Supplement is no longer applicable, the new paragraph 1.6 makes reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The new paragraph reads: "Part II of the 2008 Planning Act provides for the introduction of a Community Infrastructure levy (CIL). Local authorities will be empowered, but not required, to charge a CIL on most types of new development in their area. Local authorities can choose the CIL rate that they wish to set, but must set this out in a new legal document (a 'charging schedule') which is independently examined to ensure that it is evidence-based and appropriate for the local area. The levy will be based on a formula which relate the size of the charge to the size and character of the development paying it. The proceeds of CIL will be spent on local and sub-regional infrastructure to support the development of an area. However, this will not replace the need for mainstream public funding. The Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 were laid before the House of commons on 10 February 2010 and will, subject to approval by MP's, come into force on 6th April 2010. CIL remains outside the scope of the Planning Obligations Strategy, but will be considered in relation to work on the Core Strategy and relevant local and Sub-regional Infrastructure studies."	Insert new paragraph 1.6 to read: "Part II of the 2008 Planning Act provides for the introduction of a Community Infrastructure levy (CIL). Local authorities will be empowered, but not required, to charge a CIL on most types of new development in their area. Local authorities can choose the CIL rate that they wish to set, but must set this out in a new legal document (a 'charging schedule') which is independently examined to ensure that it is evidence-based and appropriate for the local area. The levy will be based on a formula which relate the size of the charge to the size and character of the development paying it. The proceeds of CIL will be spent on local and sub-regional infrastructure to support the development of an area. However, this will not replace the need for mainstream public funding. The Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 were laid before the House of commons on 10 February 2010 and will, subject to approval by MP's, come into force on 6th April 2010. CIL remains outside the scope of the Planning Obligations Strategy , but will be considered in relation to work on the Core Strategy and relevant local and Sub-regional Infrastructure studies."
2.10				
1270 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	Paragraph 2.10 should read PPS9 and not PPG9. Additionally, reference to PPS9 Guide to Good Practice would be beneficial	Concern noted. The reference to PPG 9 has been amended to read "PPS 9 and Good Practice Guide."	Amend "PPG 9" to "PPS 9 and Good Practice Guide."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>2.11</i>				
1271 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	Paragraph 2.11 should include reference to Structure Plan Policy P2/4 Development and Expansion of Employment Clusters; which includes reference to contributions from businesses to provision of key worker housing. It should also include Policy P8/6 - 'Improving bus and community transport service'.	No change agreed. The East of England Plan has now been adopted, which supersedes much of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003. Policy 2/4 was not saved and should not be inserted in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3. Methodology for Calculating and Applying Contributions to Community Infrastructure				
3.0.1				
1212 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The bullet points need to be revised to properly reflect the true numbering of the document. Specifically 'Education' needs to be added.	Concerns noted. The bullet points will be revised to reflect the numbering of the remaining sections of Section 3.	Revise bullet points to reflect the numbering of the remaining sections of Section 3.
1654 - LSC Cambridgeshire (Dr Jon Nay) [498]	Object	On p.19, under 3.0.1 there is an error in the sub-headings. Education and Lifelong Learning has been omitted and the Community Facilities wrongly numbered.	Concerns noted. These errors will be corrected in the final SPD.	Correct numbering and titles of sections in paragraph 3.0.1
1526 - Cambridgeshire PCT (Mr Ian Burns) [917]	Object	The PCT provided some initial information to the Council in its preparation of the revised Strategy and commented on the earlier drafts. We are pleased that some of our recommendations have been incorporated into the strategy but feel that they do not go far enough in ensuring that future developments in Cambridge contribute, where appropriate, to the provision of health services and infrastructure.	Concerns noted. It is considered that there is currently an insufficient evidence base to support the blanket requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit towards primary care facilities on schemes of 100 dwelling units or more. Rather than include a standard charge in the SPD, it is proposed to delete this and include reference to the potential for planning obligations to support primary care facilities on a site by site basis in the section that deals with other potential development specific planning obligation requirements. This does not prevent contributions from being sought for such facilities if the PCT can demonstrate a specific need at the time of a planning application or during pre-application discussion. In addition, robust processes would need to be in place first to ensure full accountability and transparency of process in relation to expenditure of financial contributions, given that these would be outside the Council's control.	Delete requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit on schemes of 100 units or more and insert reference to 'Primary care facilities (5/12, 5/13, 5/14)' in the bullet pointed list within 'Other Potential Development-Specific Planning Requirements'.
1464 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	In practice, to date, the Trust's clinical developments have not been required to make contributions to general community infrastructure schemes and the Trust would be looking for the revised Planning Obligations Strategy to confirm this principle for SCATP and other categories.	The SCATP currently has an exemption for clinical developments. As the City Council is not the authority responsible for progressing the Area Corridor Transport Plan review, the County Council would need to confirm any change in approach as the review progresses. The other infrastructure requirements outlined in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD are not normally applied to non-residential development.	
1294 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	The County Council believes there is a strong argument for including archaeology and the historic environment within the Strategy.	Concerns noted. A further bullet point on measures to protect and enhance the historic environment, including archaeology, will be included in paragraph 3.9.1.	Insert a further bullet point on measures to protect and enhance the historic environment, including archaeology, in paragraph 3.9.1.
1650 - Natural England (Mr Justin Tilley) [496]	Support	Natural England is satisfied that this document provides prominence to open space and recreation among the physical and social infrastructure required to support new development.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.0.2</i>				
1640 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) Limited [243]	Object	<p>The SPD sets out standard charges for the provision of facilities, however it is not clear how these sums have been derived. As the SPD will not be subject to scrutiny at Examination it is crucial that the evidence base is published to enable public review and understanding of the basis for the standard sums sought. Failure to do this could lead to a lack of transparency. In our view the Council should publish copies of the research upon which the sums are derived for review and further consultation.</p> <p>In short it is our position that both the sums and the triggers in terms of residential units are arbitrary and should be justified.</p>	Concern noted. The formulae for calculating charges varies dependent on the infrastructure type. It is considered that appropriate levels of information on specific infrastructure requirements are set in the topic specific sections of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.	
1649 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc [240]	Object	Morrisons object to the application of standard formula for the calculation of planning obligations, as this approach does not allow for the consideration of individual sites and does not meet the policy tests set out by Circular 5/05.	Concern noted. The purpose of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is to provide developers with clarity from the outset as to what level of contributions might be sought. The exact amount that will be sought will be negotiated on a case by case basis having regard to the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.	
<i>3.1.1</i>				
1373 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	It is noted that the City Council intends to produce a separate Affordable Housing SPD but it would be helpful to have the requirements specified in a single accessible document. This section begins to allude to how affordable housing provision will be determined and defined but it does not contain any meaningful information. If this information is to be provided in a separate SPD then that is where it should be placed to avoid any confusion or ambiguity. As already indicated there is little merit in reciting planning policy summaries from the Local Plan.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
1213 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The publication of the Affordable Housing SPD needs to be brought forward speedily in order to give certainty to developers, particularly in respect of Policy 5/6. Ideally, this should be published in conjunction with the POS SPD.	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (adopted January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>With reference to Policy 5/6 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, this policy has now been deleted because it was</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			recognised at the Examination in Public for the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the East of England that there was an absence of convincing evidence that specific local circumstances existed to justify the imposition of the requirement as referred to in the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The Affordable Housing SPD does not provide any further detail in taking this policy forward. The Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England does not make specific reference to the need for employment development to provide for affordable housing and Policy P9/1 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 was not saved.	
1329 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	It is unfortunate that the detailed guidance in respect of affordable housing provision is not included in the Planning Obligation Strategy but must await the adoption of a further Supplementary Planning Document.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
<i>3.1.2</i>				
1272 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	Definition of affordable housing should be made clearer.	Concerns noted. Affordable housing is discussed in detail in the Council's Affordable Housing SPD. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.1.3</i>				
1273 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	Definition of affordable housing should be made clearer.	Concerns noted. Affordable housing is discussed in detail in the Council's Affordable Housing SPD. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
<i>3.1.4</i>				
1300 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	This paragraph should be amended to include the provision of student housing within the affordable housing types.The Council should also provide a justification for why the costs of low cost housing (mortgage and rent) should not exceed 30% of the gross median household incomes in Cambridge.	Concerns noted. However, the City Council has never treated student units as equivalent to normal housing units. Accordingly it does not accept the provision of student units as meeting any affordable housing requirement on a site. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
1214 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Second bullet point, point b) Low cost home ownership: Discounted market housing no longer forms part of the definition of affordable housing in PPS3. The SPD is therefore not in accordance with Government planning policy and should be revised before publication.	Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
1274 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	Definition of affordable housing should be made clearer - suggest adding to the definition in 3.1.4 a third bullet saying that 'the aim is to make the various house types available in perpetuity'.	Concerns noted. Affordable housing is discussed in detail in the Council's Affordable Housing SPD. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been	Delete Sub-section 3.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
followed.				
<i>3.1.5</i>				
1665 - South Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Jonathan Dixon) [502]	Object	Para 3.1.5 indicates that other groups of workers 'can be recognised' as key workers - the actual process is unclear and it perhaps should spell out that this will be at the councils discretion not the developer. It could usefully indicate why other groups of workers would be 'key' given that affordability issues and recruitment problems probably apply to all low paid workers in the area.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed. The definition of key worker is now provided in paragraph 5.10 of the Council's Affordable Housing SPD.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
1301 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to the Council's approach to located key worker housing within 30 minute distance by public transport or other sustainable transport modes of their place of work. The first sentence of this paragraph should therefore be removed.	Concerns noted. However, this approach is followed in the Council's adopted Affordable Housing SPD, supporting the sustainable development of Cambridge. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.1.7</i>				
1492 - Cambridge Older People's Enterprise (Mr Robert Boorman) [477]	Object	Affordable and special needs housing (What is Affordable?) I understand that 40% is the target, why this figure?	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>Affordable housing is defined in paragraph 6 of the Council's Affordable Housing SPD as "Affordable housing includes social rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Affordable housing should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meet the needs of eligible households including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford, determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. - Include provision for the home to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or, if these restrictions are lifted, for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision." <p>The Council adopted a target of 40% affordable housing in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 based on need. This target exceeds the minimum regional target (35%) set out in Policy H2 of the East of England Plan 2008.</p> 	Delete Sub-section 3.1
1479 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) (Dr H Kamminga) [472]	Object	It should be a requirement that affordable housing within any specific development is spread throughout that development, and not concentrated in one part. The aim should be social integration, not the creation of ghettos.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed. The siting of affordable housing provision to avoid social exclusion is dealt with in paragraph 23 of the Council's Affordable Housing SPD.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
1147 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This is consistent with the Proposed Changes Policy H3 that sets out the expectation that, regionally, some 35% of all new development is affordable housing.	Support noted. However Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and	Delete Sub-section 3.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.				
<i>3.1.8</i>				
1302 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	The end of Paragraph 3.1.8 should be amended to state the following: "...The nature and type of affordable housing to be provided in a development, and the overall dwelling type mix to be provided in it, will be informed by the result of the Sub-regional Housing Market Assessment and other material evidence applicable at the time of each planning application. These provisions will be subject to negotiation with the aim of getting the best fit between housing needs of all tenures, the creation of sustainable communities and available resources.	Concerns noted. However, Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
1330 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	Where viability assessments are required to determine the extent of any planning obligation, such as affordable housing, the mechanism for evaluating 'viability' must be properly documented in the strategy and be clear and transparent to prospective applicants. It is not sufficient to say that such assessments will be dealt with on a case by case basis.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed. The issue of viability is dealt with the Council's Affordable Housing SPD and in Policy 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
1531 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The Council refers to the need to take account of viability of development sites and whether or not there are other planning objectives that need to be given priority. However, it fails to make any specific mention to the availability or not of grant funding. Circular 5/05 makes it very apparent that this will be a major factor in determining what levels of affordable housing provision can be delivered. Such a reference should be included in the document's text.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed. The issue of viability is dealt with in the Council's Affordable Housing SPD.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
1215 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The SPD acknowledges that the amount of affordable housing provided as part of a development site can be subject to viability testing which is welcomed. However the SPD should set out clearly that the mix of affordable housing can also be subject to viability testing as well as the amount. The mix of affordable housing is just as important as the amount of affordable housing to the viability of a scheme and this needs to be recognized in the	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		SPD.	The issue of viability is considered in paragraphs 41 - 45 of the Council's Affordable Housing SPD and in Policy 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Furthermore the mix of development is also dealt with in the Council's Affordable Housing SPD.	
1190 - Impington Parish Council (Ms Vanessa Kelly) [448]	Object	Given the shortage of Affordable Housing in Cambridge, and employment growth, the wording of 3.1.8 needs firming up if developers are to keep to the 40% threshold. "Viability considerations" could be open to a very wide interpretation.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed. Paragraph 42 of the Affordable Housing SPD deals with the issue of viability.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
3.1.9				
1217 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	This paragraph needs to be amended to allow for the provision of off-site affordable housing where this cannot be provided on-site, either due to the physical characteristics of the site or the nature of the development. Off-site affordable housing should be allowed either on a recognized housing site provided by the employer/developer or in the form of a contribution. The SPD needs to show sufficient flexibility in the application of policy 5/6 and this paragraph needs to be amended.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (adopted January 2008). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed. With reference to Policy 5/6 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, this policy has now been deleted because it was recognised at the Examination in Public for the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the East of England that there was an absence of convincing evidence that specific local circumstances existed to justify the imposition of the requirement as referred to in the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The Affordable Housing SPD does not provide any further detail in taking this policy forward. The Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England does not make specific reference to the need for employment development to provide for affordable housing and Policy P9/1 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 was not saved.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
1666 - South Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Jonathan Dixon) [502]	Object	Similarly the word 'recognised' here could be qualified to indicate that it means recognised and approved by the council.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate	Delete Sub-section 3.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1462 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Support	The Trust is pleased that the current Local Plan and this SPD document acknowledges that existing provision of staff residences on-site satisfies the requirements of Policy 5/6 (paragraph 3.1.9) and so that Trust's developments are not included in a requirement to contribute to Affordable Housing.	Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed. Support noted. However, Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
<i>3.1.10</i>				
1218 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The definition of C2 'hospitals' needs to be more concise. Other parts of the SPD refer to residential care homes but this is not specified here. The SPD needs to be consistent, and there is a need for clarification in relation to Affordable Housing.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.1.11</i>				
1219 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The SPD refers to Affordable Housing SPD. The Affordable Housing SPD needs to be brought forward as a matter of priority; or the POS SPD should incorporate particularly the thresholds of to which Policy 5/6 apply. This is needed to provide clarity and certainty to developers, and to ensure that the policy is complied by consistently across the City (except where viability testing shows that these thresholds should be relaxed).	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>With reference to Policy 5/6 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, this policy has now been deleted because it was recognised at the Examination in Public for the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the East of England that there was an absence of convincing evidence that specific local circumstances existed to justify the imposition of the requirement as referred to in the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The Affordable Housing SPD does not provide any further detail in taking this policy forward. The Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England does not make specific reference to the need for employment development to provide for affordable housing and Policy P9/1 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 was not saved.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.1
<i>3.1.13</i>				
1480 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) (Dr H Kamminga) [472]	Object	We regard it as unacceptable that financial contributions in lieu of affordable housing should ever be allowed. There should be no exceptions.	<p>Concerns noted. However, there may be exceptional circumstances under which an alternative to on-site provision may be acceptable. These circumstances are set out in Annex 3 of the Council's Affordable Housing SPD.</p> <p>Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.1
1220 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The Affordable Housing SPD needs to be brought forward as soon as possible. This is needed to provide clarity and certainty to developers, and to ensure that the policy is complied by consistently across the City (except where	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have	Delete Sub-section 3.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		viability testing shows that these thresholds should be relaxed). Where these contributions are used to fund housing schemes, these sites need to be clearly identified, as does how such contributions will be used. An annual monitoring report should be produced to show where this funding is used.	<p>been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>A planning obligations monitoring report is produced annually and presented at Environment Scrutiny Committee.</p>	
1667 - South Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Jonathan Dixon) [502]	Object	Spending off-site contributions - this could usefully include Fringe Sites/Northstowe and any strategic site where the City has access by whatever route to the affordable housing produced rather than restricting it to the city area. This might not be an option the Council wish to take up but by including it in their policy they leave the door open should they decide to do this at some point in the future.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.1
<i>3.1.14</i>				
1221 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	It is not clear from the POS SPD where phasing and mechanism for delivery for affordable housing in the Areas of Major Change will be set out. The text in this paragraph needs to be made clearer to show where this will be addressed. In any event, this needs to be discussed as a matter of priority to allow the Areas of Major Change to come forward speedily and in accordance with the housing requirements of the Local Plan.	<p>Concerns noted. This matter should be dealt with through the planning application process for sites within the Areas of Major Change.</p> <p>Sub-section 3.1 - Affordable Housing has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has now produced and adopted a separate Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008) . All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to affordable housing and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.2 Transport				
1662 - Highways Agency (Mr Tony Potter) [204]	Object	<p>In light of our full submission our conclusions are that with regard to development-specific transport improvements, the SPD briefly lists examples of the types of on and off-site improvements that may be required to mitigate the direct impacts of an individual development. However, it is disappointing that the SPD provides no guidance on how to establish the transport impacts or mitigation requirements. The SPD should refer to Circular 02/2007, DfT's Guidance on Transport Assessment as well as the various DfT Travel Plan guidance documents.</p> <p>In terms of developer contributions towards strategic transport facilities/infrastructure, it is extremely disappointing that the draft SPD does not provide any new guidance/policies since it simply refers to other, out of date SPG.</p> <p>At the very least, the existing ATPs should be updated to include current RPI/construction values and demonstrate cognisance of National, Regional and Local Planning and Transportation policies. That is, the SPD needs to demonstrate a greater emphasis towards (evidence-based) sustainable, environmental and accessibility based policies.</p>	<p>Concern noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD will be updated to make reference to up to date guidance in order that the section better reflects current transport thinking and assessment networks. With regards to the need to update Area Transport Plans to include current RPI/construction figures, the Area Corridor Transport Plans are in the process of being reviewed by Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highways Authority. These will need to be read alongside the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD once they are adopted.</p> <p>It should be noted, however, that SPDs cannot set new policy; they can only provide guidance related to existing adopted policies set out in higher level documents that have been subject to independent examination.</p>	Amend section 3.2 of the SPD to make reference to up to date transport guidance including DfT Circular 02/2007, the Local Transport Plan, Regional Transport Strategy, Corridor Area Transport Plans, Long Term Transport Strategy (2006-2021) and the Highway Network Management Policies and Standards.
1374 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	This section also concentrates upon the recital of existing policies and provides little detailed guidance. If the City Council intends to produce Area Transport Plans then it might be more appropriate to signpost the reader to these documents and simplify the content of this section accordingly. The useful comments contained within this section are lost as a consequence.	Concern noted. A significant amount of information is contained within the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD and the methodology has been split into subject categories. It is felt that the planning policy summaries contained at the start of each section provide a useful context for each topic, and this would be lost if they were moved to an appendix. While minor changes will be made to the layout of the document in terms of paragraph numbering and section headings, it is felt that no further changes are necessary.	
1651 - Natural England (Mr Justin Tilley) [496]	Object	Natural England welcomes the inclusion of provision for walking and cycling in this section. Our particular interests relate to improving sustainable access to open space, including the surrounding countryside, and we suggest that this aspect of provision for walking and cycling is expanded upon and referenced to the following section on Open Space and Recreation.	Concerns noted. However, the City Council considers that the level of coverage of cycling and walking issues in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is appropriate.	
3.2.2				
1281 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	Paragraph 3.2.2 should also refer to Structure Plan Policy P9/9 which sets out the Cambridge Sub Region Transport Strategy.	Concerns noted. Reference will be made to Policy 9/9 Cambridge Sub Region Transport Strategy in Paragraph 3.2.2	Insert Policy 9/9 Cambridge Sub Region Transport Strategy in the final sentence of paragraph 3.2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.2.3				
1222 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	It is not clear why one of the objectives from Chapter 8 (page 85 of the Local Plan) has been omitted from the SPD. The SPD is not consistent with the Local Plan as a result. The SPD should be consistent with the Local Plan and be revised to reflect the objectives of that document.	Concerns noted. The third objective of Chapter 8 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 has been omitted in error. A new third bullet point will be inserted, which reads: "To minimise adverse effects of transport on people and the environment."	Insert a new third bullet point in Paragraph 3.2.3, which reads: "To minimise adverse effects of transport on people and the environment."
3.2.4				
1276 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	There are two paragraphs numbered 3.2.4.	Concerns noted. This will be corrected in the final SPD.	Remove repetition of 3.2.4
3.2.5				
1331 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	<p>Similarly it is unfortunate that the details of any new transport related contributions must await the review of the four Area Corridor Transport Plans (ACTP's). The University would expect any revised documents to be published for consultation purposes before adoption.</p> <p>The University believes that there needs greater clarity and transparency as to how projects are selected for inclusion in the ACTP's, how the costs are derived and how contributions are allocated to projects. We believe that no projects should be included in the ACTP's unless details of the scheme have been approved by the Area Joint Committee.</p> <p>The University also believes that ACTP's should also incorporate a modal split into the trip rate calculation and provide an incentive by way of reduced contributions for those developments promoting sustainable modes of transport.</p>	Concern noted. As part of the review of the Corridor Area Transport Plans (CATP) being undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council, the way transport calculations are calculated is also being re-examined. A report on the update of the CATPs is going to the Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire county Council Joint Transport Forum in February for consideration by Members and Officers. The County Council will carry out consultation on the proposed revisions to the CATPs as appropriate.	Amend paragraph 3.2.5 to make reference to the revisions to the Area Corridor Transport Plans.
1169 - unex holdings limited (Mr stephen walsh) [445]	Object	The area transport plans do not fairly apportion contributions in relation to the actual impact of any particular development. They unfairly place the burden on developers of making good historic infrastructure shortcomings. The trip generation calculations are far too high and the charge per trip is excessive. Taking pedestrian trips into account causes double counting with public realm contributions. There is too much scope for the council to spend the monies on schemes which are totally unrelated to the particular development.	Concern noted. As part of the review of the Corridor Area Transport Plans (CATP) being undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council, the way transport calculations are calculated is also being re-examined. A report on the update of the CATPs is going to the Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council Joint Transport Forum in February for consideration by Members and Officers. Once adopted, the revised CATPs will act as companion documents to the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.	Amend paragraph 3.2.5 to make reference to the revisions to the Area Corridor Transport Plans.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1223 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	This paragraph needs to be amended to make it clear that the revised technical guidance will replace the Area Transport Plans.	Concern noted. Cambridgeshire County Council are currently undertaking a review of the Area Corridor Transport Plans (CATP). A report on the update of the CATPs is going to the Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council Joint Transport Forum in February for consideration by Members and officers. While this review process is underway the Southern, Eastern, Western and Northern CATPs will remain as companion documents to the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. As currently worded it is felt that the SPD provides sufficient clarity in relation to the revised CATPs replacing the existing versions as companion documents once they are adopted.	Amend paragraph 3.2.5 to make reference to revisions of the Area Corridor Transport Plans.
1532 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>The Council refers to Area Transport Plans being prepared which will be companion documents to the SPD, and which will set out in detail the mechanism by which contributions will be sought from developments towards the provision of new transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The HBF strongly feels that any substantive new requirements ought to be clearly set out in a DPD document and subject to the proper level of public scrutiny. Given that Transport Plans will not even possess SPD status it is unclear as to their precise role and purpose. Clearly they will not be capable of being merited any significant status as planning documents.</p>	Concern noted. Circular 05/2005 allows planning contributions to be sought in order to mitigate the impacts of new development, and this includes impacts on strategic transport infrastructure. The Area Corridor Transport Plans, prepared by Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highways Authority having undergone the necessary public scrutiny, have the status of material considerations in the determination of planning applications, so as such there is justification for their use in the negotiation of planning contributions. Following their review, if endorsed by Councils the Area Corridor Transport Plans will carry the same weight as a Supplementary Planning Document. In addition, specific reference to the use of Area Corridor Transport Plans in the determination of planning contributions is made in the CLG publication "Planning Obligations: Practice Guide" as a case study of good practice (see Case Study 3.4).	
3.2.7				
1224 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	"?????" - the document is not complete and needs to be revised. There are several such issues throughout this document (in most sub-chapters there are a number of paragraphs with the same references).	Concern noted. All formatting errors will be rectified prior to the SPD being adopted.	Rectify all formatting errors.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.2.10</i>				
1494 - Cambridge Older People's Enterprise (Mr Robert Boorman) [477]	Object	Public Transport does not seem to be as high on the list of priorities as COPE would like to see it. It seems to us that if new householders moving into an area are to not become dependent on their private cars it is vital that buses are available from day one to take residents into Cambridge City. A way needs to be found so Section 106 money or some other source of funding is found to subsidise transport until the number of residents increases to the point where the routes become economically viable. COPE would feel that encouraging public transport in new development would be more beneficial long-term than subsidising late night bus provision.	Concern noted. The City Council views improvements to public transport as an important consideration and the need to enhance and promote public transport is recognised in the earlier paragraphs of section 3.2 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. One of the key objectives of the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan is to develop integrated transport and to promote public transport and other sustainable modes of transport such as cycling or walking. The exact means by which developments will be required to mitigate their impacts on Cambridge's strategic transport infrastructure will be negotiated on a case by case basis. There are examples in Cambridge of developers subsidising bus services, for example the Uni 4 service which is subsidised by the University of Cambridge, and there are other measures that can be used to encourage people to use public transport as an alternative to private cars, such as through residential travel planning.	
1277 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	In paragraph 3.2.10, we strongly welcome the mention of real time information, but there is an opportunity here to mention the whole package of smarter choice measures.	Concern noted. The SPD will be amended to include the whole package of smarter choice measures as set out in the DfT publication "Smarter Choices - Changing the way we travel".	Insert the following after the fourth sentence of paragraph 3.2.10: "Other smarter choice measures aimed at shifting peoples travel behaviour towards more sustainable options are set out in the Department for Transport's Smarter Choices strategy. These measures include the use of school, workplace and individualised travel planning, improvements to public transport and marketing services such as travel awareness campaigns, setting up websites for car sharing schemes, support for car clubs and encouragement of teleworking".

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.2.11				
1278 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	In paragraph 3.2.11, there is opportunity here to expand the paragraph to include all travel planning and include mention of travel initiatives that might be promoted such as car sharing, car clubs and teleworking and conferencing.	Concern noted. Additional text will be added to paragraph 3.2.10 to reflect the wider range of travel initiatives available, making specific reference to the DfT's Smarter Choices strategy.	Insert the following after the fourth sentence of paragraph 3.2.10: "Other smarter choice measures aimed at shifting peoples travel behaviour towards more sustainable options are set out in the Department for Transport's Smarter Choices strategy. These measures include the use of school, workplace and individualised travel planning, improvements to public transport and marketing services such as travel awareness campaigns, setting up websites for car sharing schemes, support for car clubs and encouragement of teleworking".
3.2.12				
1225 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	This paragraph should not just refer to the Areas of Major Change. A need for infrastructure could arise in other areas of the City, and this should be reflected in this paragraph. The burden of responsibility of transport and other infrastructure should not just fall on the Areas of Major Change, especially where these are located in central locations, such as at the Station, where other developments will have a cumulative impact on such infrastructure.	Concerns noted. However, paragraph 3.2.12 does refer to the city as a whole, not just the Areas of Major Change.	
1161 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This requirement and the associated guidance is consistent with Policies CSR4, T1, T4, T9 and T14 of the Proposed Changes.	Support noted.	
3.2.13				
1162 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This requirement and the associated guidance is consistent with Policies CSR4, T1, T4, T9 and T14 of the Proposed Changes.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.2.14</i>				
1534 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>There appears to be no specific statutory planning policy justification requires financial contributions for developments that generate in excess of 50 additional person trips to and from the site on a daily basis. Without such a policy it is inappropriate to introduce such a policy and contribution requirements via SPD.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Area Corridor Transport Plans do not appear to have any planning status. Therefore, the SPD should not refer to requirements set out in a non-planning document. This is considered contrary to planning legislation. The Council must set out planning requirements within documents produced under its LDS.</p>	<p>Concern noted. Circular 05/2005 allows planning contributions to be sought in order to mitigate the impacts of new development, and this includes impacts on strategic transport infrastructure. The Area Corridor Transport Plans, prepared by Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highways Authority, have the status of material considerations in the determination of planning applications, so as such there is justification for their use in the negotiation of planning contributions. In addition, specific reference to the use of Area Corridor Transport Plans in the determination of planning contributions is made in the CLG publication "Planning Obligations: Practice Guide" as a case study of good practice (see Case Study 3.4).</p>	
1279 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	<p>In paragraph 3.2.14, there should be some linkage to the range of smarter travel choices available either in this policy or the Area Corridor Transport Plans. Whilst a 50 trips figure will attract contributions, these will currently tend to be more geared towards hard physical measures. The 50 trips figure might also be revised as part of the ACTP update - therefore the County Council suggests that either the mention of 50 trips is removed, or some flexibility is built into the document.</p>	<p>Concern noted. However, until the revised CATPs are adopted, the 50-trip figure set out in paragraph 3.2.14 still applies.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD does not set policy. It supports policy set out in the Local Plan relating to planning obligations. SPDs cannot be used to create new policies; policies can only be set through the preparation of development plan documents, which are subject to independent examination.</p>	
1163 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	<p>This requirement and the associated guidance is consistent with Policies CSR4, T1, T4, T9 and T14 of the Proposed Changes.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	
<i>3.2.15</i>				
1535 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>The Area Corridor Transport Plans do not appear to have any planning status. Therefore, the SPD should not refer to requirements set out in a non-planning document. This is considered contrary to planning legislation. The Council must set out planning requirements within documents produced under its LDS. Nor should reference be made to adherence to other future documents that might replace these Transport Plans whose precise status and content is completely unknown.</p>	<p>Concern noted. Circular 05/2005 allows planning contributions to be sought in order to mitigate the impacts of new development, and this includes impacts on strategic transport infrastructure. The Area Corridor Transport Plans, prepared by Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highways Authority, have the status of material considerations in the determination of planning applications, so as such there is justification for their use in the negotiation of planning contributions. In addition, specific reference to the use of Area Corridor Transport Plans in the determination of planning contributions is made in the CLG publication "Planning Obligations: Practice Guide" as a case study of good practice (see Case Study 3.4).</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1164 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This requirement and the associated guidance is consistent with Policies CSR4, T1, T4, T9 and T14 of the Proposed Changes.	Support noted.	
<i>3.2.16</i>				
1170 - unex holdings limited (Mr stephen walsh) [445]	Object	Strategic improvement contributions are not fair. They should not be charged in addition to development specific contributions or, at least, credit should be allowed for the development specific payments. Otherwise the developer is being made to pay twice. There is double counting caused by including all-mode trips but then separately making public realm charges.	Concern noted. The purpose of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is to set the framework for the provision of new or improved infrastructure where this is required to mitigate any adverse impact from new development. The exact requirements will be negotiated on a case by case basis in light of the five tests set out in Circular 05/2005 in order to ensure that the contributions being sought are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. However, it needs to be recognised that the strategic transport infrastructure in Cambridge is under considerable pressure and that new development can create further pressure on transport systems, for which mitigation will be required.	
1536 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The precise formula and justification for transport contributions being sought is unclear. Neither is it apparent what statutory planning policy justification there is for seeking payments per trip.	Paragraph 3.2.15 makes it clear that the mechanism by which contributions to strategic improvements are calculated is set out in the Area Transport Plans. These documents, which have the status as material considerations in the determination of planning applications, are companion documents to the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as set out paragraph 3.2.5 of the SPD. The calculation is based on trip generation rates for new developments. This approach is supported by the East of England Regional Assembly as it is in accordance with policies in the East of England Plan.	
1165 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This requirement and the associated guidance is consistent with Policies CSR4, T1, T4, T9 and T14 of the Proposed Changes.	Support noted.	
<i>3.2.17</i>				
1280 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	In paragraph 3.2.17, this paragraph should be renamed "Smarter choices". Subsequent paragraphs could then detail work place travel plans, school travel plans, personalised travel plans etc. A local target could also be set here, eg, "development of more than X dwellings will require a residential travel plan".	Agree that in order to better to reflect the shift in thinking on travel planning since the publication of PPG13 the sub title of this section could be more usefully refer to Smarter Choices.	Amend sub title to "Smarter Choices".
1275 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	Many smarter travel options (eg promotion) are not considered in current planning policy guidance. Whilst PPG13 (published 2001) has detailed information on workplace-based travel planning and is well reflected in this	Agree that thinking on Travel Planning has moved on considerably since the publication of PPG13, especially in relation to Personalised Travel Planning and Residential Travel Planning. The City Council also agrees that the DfTs	Amend the sub title for this section to "Smarter Choices". Amend paragraph 3.2.17 as follows:

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		SPD (paragraph 3.2.17), more recent guidance is not. "Making Residential Travel Plans Work: Guidelines for new development" (DfT 2005) more accurately reflects current thinking on travel planning, and by not reflecting this latest guidance in the SPD an opportunity could be missed.	guidance for residential travel plans is one of the most recent example of best practice and should be recognised in the SPD.	<p>"The Department for Transport's "Smarter Choices - Changing the way we travel" recommends that the following types of 'soft measures' are considered for developments that are shown to have a significant impact on the transport network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Workplace and school travel plans; * Personalised travel planning, travel awareness campaigns, and public transport * Information and marketing; * Car clubs and car sharing schemes; * Teleworking, teleconferencing and home shopping. <p>For further guidance on travel planning, reference should be made to Department for Transport's "Making Residential Travel Plans Work: Guidelines for new development" and "Good Practice Guidelines: Delivering Travel Plans through the Planning system". "</p>
1166 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This requirement and the associated guidance is consistent with Policies CSR4, T1, T4, T9 and T14 of the Proposed Changes.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.2.19</i>				
1537 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The Area Corridor Transport Plans do not appear to have any planning status. Therefore, the SPD should not refer to requirements set out in a non-planning document. This is considered contrary to planning legislation. The Council must set out its planning requirements within documents produced under its LDS. Nor should reference be made to adherence to other future documents that might replace these Transport Plans whose precise status and content is completely unknown.	Concern noted. Circular 05/2005 allows planning contributions to be sought in order to mitigate the impacts of new development, and this includes impacts on strategic transport infrastructure. The Area Corridor Transport Plans, prepared by Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highways Authority having undergone the necessary public scrutiny, have the status of material considerations in the determination of planning applications, so as such there is justification for their use in the negotiation of planning contributions. In addition, specific reference to the use of Area Corridor Transport Plans in the determination of planning contributions is made in the CLG publication "Planning Obligations: Practice Guide" as a case study of good practice (see Case Study 3.4).	
1171 - unex holdings limited (Mr stephen walsh) [445]	Object	The council should not be allowed to change the list of schemes in the area transport plans unless they refund to the developer monies previously paid towards schemes which are subsequently deleted from the list.	Concern noted. This paragraph does not make reference to the lists of projects being changed, but that the priority given to projects contained within the lists will be reviewed. The precise nature of the mitigation measures being sought in relation to transport impacts and the projects that developments will be required to contribute towards, will be negotiated on a case by case basis. These negotiations will have regard to the five tests set out in Circular 05/2005, in order to ensure that any contributions sought are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. Where monies for specific schemes from the Area Transport Plans are referenced in the legal agreement, they can only be used for the stated schemes. If subsequently a scheme is deleted from the Area Transport Plans without these monies having been spent then the contribution will be refunded to the developer or the County Council may negotiate an alternative scheme with the developer, provided that it conforms with the requirements of Circular 05/2005.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.2.20</i>				
1226 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The Council should make public annual figures on the funds in each pool in the interests of clarity, openness and to prevent double counting. A final sentence should be added to the SPD to this effect.	Concern noted. The monitoring of Planning Obligations is considered in Section 5 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. Specifically, reference is made at paragraph 5.6 to the publication of an annual monitoring report detailing S106 receipts and expenditures. Given that the SPD should be read as a whole, it is unnecessary to repeat this information here.	
1303 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	The last sentence in this paragraph should be amended to read as follows: "...As some of the larger projects identified may require contributions from a number of developments in order to fully implement them, an agreed expenditure programme will need to be put in place in order that sufficient funds can be built up to fund projects. Furthermore, the Council makes no reference to the requirement for any financial contributions to be returned to developers in the event that contributions are made towards specific infrastructure provision but the provision is not provided within an agreed timeframe.	Concern noted. With regards to the suggested change to paragraph 3.2.20, the Council feels that this does not add additional clarity to the SPD, and that in this instance no change to the SPD. In terms of timescales and mechanisms for repayment of unspent monies, this issue is specifically referenced in paragraph B24 of Circular 05/2005. As such, it is considered that this level of detail should not be included in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. The timing of the rebate would depend on the precise wording of a legal agreement, which would be monitored by the Council and the developer.	
1172 - unex holdings limited (Mr stephen walsh) [445]	Object	10 years is far to long to hold the money. This should be reduced to 5 years. The SPG should include a clear mechanism for the repayment to developers for unspent monies.	Concern noted. The wording in this paragraph indicates some flexibility on expenditure periods as this will be established on a case by case for strategic transport improvements.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.3 Open Space and Recreation</i>				
1458 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	<p>We have explained on many occasions that requiring NHS providers (Primary, Secondary and Tertiary care) to contribute to planning obligations would reduce the cash available for healthcare and therefore have a direct impact on the health of the local population.</p> <p>In the section on SCATP contributions (para 3.2.14) the document makes specific reference to hospital and Health Service providers explaining that these organisations will be considered flexibly as special cases. The Trust requests that similar wording is inserted into sections of the document concerning Open Space, Waste, Public Realm and Public Art. This would be consistent with the endorsement of the decision of the Cambridgeshire Horizons Board in April 2005 in the following wording:</p> <p>"Primary Healthcare Schemes and NHS Hospital and Clinical Service developments should not be required to contribute to other community infrastructure funding, provided that the services to be made available will serve the essential needs of the population of the Cambridge sub-region".</p>	Concern noted. It is not considered appropriate to release NHS providers from planning obligations on a wholesale basis as development may still have an impact which requires mitigation. However, there may be instances where this is appropriate on a site by site basis.	
1295 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	The County Council would like to see more reference to public rights of way amongst the discussion on pedestrian and cyclist journeys for business and pleasure.	It is not considered that the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is the place for detailed discussion of this issue.	
3091 - Mr David McKeown [470]	Object	<p>The Council has stated that objectives repeated throughout 3.3 to protect and enhance green spaces and that new public open spaces are created (3.3.2). Where? Constructing a MUGA in Nightingale Avenue park will use up green space thus reducing the area available for the many sports played on grass. The park is used on Saturdays by up to 4 teams of young footballers playing in the league. A hard surfaced MUGA is not needed or wanted.</p> <p>I urge the Council to postpone the proposed MUGA until the floodlit pitch is constructed at Netherhall which may fulfill the needs of the area.</p>	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1455 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	An audit trail is required to detail how the various contributions are expended as it is extremely unlikely that all these costs would be taken up in the provision of new open space. The figures are based on new provision. Where is the commitment to provide new areas for informal open space? Most of the projects listed are refurbishment or improvement with maintenance funding streams already in place.	Concern noted. Section 5 on Monitoring makes reference to the compilation of annual planning obligations monitoring reports on receipts and expenditure. The Council is committed to providing new areas of open space, but recognises that in a densely populated urban area this can be difficult to achieve. As such it may be more appropriate to enhance the offer of existing open spaces.	
1516 - Sport England (Mr Philip Raiswell) [210]	Support	Sport England would like to support the approach being taken by Cambridge City Council to secure investment into sport and recreation facilities in the city. The approach is largely consistent with Sport England's guidance on preparing a local framework document, as set out within the Planning Contributions Kitbag on the Sport England website.	Support noted.	
1652 - Natural England (Mr Justin Tilley) [496]	Support	We welcome the recognition of the variety of open space types and functions these provide, especially with regard to biodiversity and informal recreation. We are pleased to see the inclusion of Strategic Open Space in the categories of provision to which contributions will be sought where appropriate - it is important to retain this scale of planning and ambition in such a document. We welcome the recognition of the importance of the Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region and the Nature Conservation Strategy. We highlight the importance of providing informal open space that is managed sympathetically for the benefit of wildlife as well as people.	Support noted. However, all references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Remove all references to Strategic Open Space
1510 - Environment Agency (Mr Adam Ireland) [214]	Support	We are pleased to see and support the fact that contributions to open space are included within the SPD. These are important as they provide recreational opportunities, wildlife habitat and cycling and pedestrian access, as well as environmental and ecological significance. Many open spaces fulfil more than one function. We note that your authority has a standard for Strategic Open Space and this shows links to the Green Infrastructure Strategy for Cambridgeshire Sub-region.	Support noted. However, all references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Remove all references to Strategic Open Space

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.3.1</i>				
1227 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Open spaces are defined as 'active and passive' recreation in the Local Plan, and this definition should be included within this paragraph. The paragraph refers to 'urban spaces' however it is unclear what these are. This term needs better definition, for example, it raises questions such as does this include sitting out spaces, public squares etc or are these areas 'public realm', or do 'urban spaces' encompass both open spaces and public realm spaces? This term needs better definition, and specifically how the term should be applied in practice. The paragraph needs to be amended to reflect this.	Concerns noted. However, given that the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD hangs off the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, it is not considered necessary to repeat the content of the Local Plan.	
1203 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	Object	3.3.1. - line 10 - strongly suggest addition of 'bridle routes' in addition to just creating cycling and pedestrian access. This is particularly relevant regarding the urban extensions to the fringes of the City and where linkages (between existing routes and old/new green infrastructure sites) for equestrian users are missing within the local countryside and as identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2006. This is based on good design principles to establish a good working infrastructure for all users of transport and recreational routes.	Concerns noted. "Equestrian" will be added to the third sentence of paragraph 3.3.1	Insert "equestrian" in the third sentence of paragraph 3.3.1 to read "cycling, equestrian and pedestrian access"
1496 - Mrs Christine Clancey [478]	Object	Stated policies to protect green spaces are being contradicted by other Council policies to hard surface and intensify use instead of creating new green spaces. Payment in lieu and commuted payments should reflect city land values. Otherwise developers will always take the cheaper option and Council will be unable to afford new open space. Consultation with residents is advocated but ignored. Biodiversity and wildlife strategy have no credence. The Council's policy of using green space to site hard surfaced enclosed sports installation is unsustainable, leading to loss of green space.	Development is not permitted by the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. In addition to protecting and enhancing existing areas of open space, the Council requires the creation of extensive new areas of public open space as a result of the development occurring in the Areas of Major Change.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.3.2				
1472 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	As explained above the Trust does not expect its clinical development to contribute to open space and recreation. It notes that paragraph 3.3.2 states that "... in some cases non residential development" will be required to contribute. This application is too vague. Clear criteria are needed and these should be anchored in policy.	Concern noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD echoes the requirements of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (paragraph 3.26), which sets out that "where appropriate, other non-residential development, including major centres of employment, may require the provision of open space. This will be dealt with through masterplanning or design briefs." As such, this will be negotiated on a site by site basis and it is felt that there is no need for further reference to this issue in the SPD.	
1497 - Mrs Christine Clancey [478]	Object	Stated policies to protect green spaces are being contradicted by other Council policies to hard surface and intensify use instead of creating new green spaces. Payment in lieu and commuted payments should reflect city land values. Otherwise developers will always take the cheaper option and Council will be unable to afford new open space. Consultation with residents is advocated but ignored. Biodiversity and wildlife strategy have no credence. The Council's policy of using green space to site hard surfaced enclosed sports installation is unsustainable, leading to loss of green space.	Development is not permitted by the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. In addition to protecting and enhancing existing areas of open space, the Council requires the creation of extensive new areas of public open space as a result of the development occurring in the Areas of Major Change.	
3.3.5				
1282 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	In paragraph 3.3.5, Structure Plan Policy P7/5 is also relevant.	Concerns noted. However, Policy 7/5 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure plan 2003 is no longer extant.	
1664 - South Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Jonathan Dixon) [502]	Object	Inclusion of mechanisms to achieve the implementation of countryside improvements outside the City through planning obligations on development within the City is supported. For example it will support developments in the southern fringe of the city to contribute to the related countryside improvements planned in South Cambridgeshire. It will be important to keep the list of projects on which contributions can be spent up to date. For example, although Northwest Cambridge and Cambridge East proposals are listed as only '2 star' priority in the Green Infrastructure Strategy, development on those sites may come forward relatively soon. It would be more sound to include a longer list of sites in the SPD to provide greater flexibility.	Concerns noted. However, all references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Remove all references to Strategic Open Space

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.3.6				
1538 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	Reference is made to the standards set out in Appendix 1 of the Adopted Local Plan. It is then stated that in addition, Cambridgeshire County Council has a standard for provision in relation to Strategic Open Space. However, unless there is a statutory planning policy to which this relates, it is inappropriate to refer to it in the SPD.	Concerns noted. All references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Remove all references to Strategic Open Space
1148 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This is consistent with Proposed Changes policies ENV1 and C2.	Support noted.	
3.3.7				
1228 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The revision of the Guidance for Interpretation and implementation of the Open Space Standards should be updated and published at same time as this SPD. Without this Guidance, this SPD cannot be properly implemented, and needs to be provided in order to provide clarity and certainty to developers and providers of open space.	Concerns noted. The Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards - Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation will be updated and provided as an Appendix to the report on the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. The updated guidance will be formally adopted at Environment Scrutiny Committee in March 2010.	Update Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards - Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation in line with the requirements of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD and put it forward for adoption at Environment Scrutiny Committee in March 2010.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.3.9				
1539 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>The text must acknowledge that only net additional dwellings will result in a population increase, and a potential burden on facilities. Directly relating population to the number of bedrooms in setting out the standards for residential development would significantly over-estimate the new population. It will considerably exceed average household sizes within the City.</p> <p>The Council states that the open space standards are applicable to all residential units created as a result of development regardless of whether they result from new-build or conversions. The text must make it clear that this relates to new net housing provision. Clearly in terms of conversions, only net additional dwellings will result in a population increase and a potential burden on facilities.</p> <p>Rather than directly relating population to the number of bedrooms it should be based upon actual evidence of local household sizes taken from the Census and population updates. In order to comply with Circular 5/05 there must be an actual linkage between the reality on the ground and open space contributions being sought.</p>	Concerns noted. However, these multipliers are in line with those adopted in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Any rates based on the last Census would be out of date given the length of time, which has elapsed since the last Census in 2001. Furthermore, the rates of occupation in existing housing stock may not accurately reflect the occupation rates of new housing stock.	
1229 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	<p>The method of calculating population included in this paragraph is very crude and will not result in a true reflection of the population of a development being calculated. For those developments which produce a large number of single person households (those with a high proportion of one-bedroom dwellings) the number of people and therefore the amount of open space is likely to be over provided. The method of calculating population should be amended to better reflect the resident population in Cambridge City. The definition should include student housing (which is identified in the Local Plan).</p>	Concerns noted. However, these multipliers are in line with those adopted in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Any rates based on the last Census would be out of date given the length of time, which has elapsed since the last Census in 2001. Furthermore, the rates of occupation in existing housing stock may not accurately reflect the occupation rates of new housing stock. Student housing, may in some instances, be required to contribute to open space provision. This issue is dealt with in Table 2 of Section 3.3.	
1178 - Smith Stuart Reynolds (Mr Geoff Bolton) [443]	Object	<p>The multipliers used to calculate the number of people are higher than average occupancy rates and will therefore produce an overestimate of the number of people accommodated within a given development. The occupancy rates contained in the latest Census should be used.</p>	Concerns noted. However, these multipliers are in line with those adopted in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Any rates based on the last Census would be out of date given the length of time, which has elapsed since the last Census in 2001. Furthermore, the rates of occupation in existing housing stock may not accurately reflect the occupation rates of new housing stock.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Table 1</i>				
1230 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The Strategic Open Space category should be removed from the table and not be required from all developments.	Concerns noted. All references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Remove all references to Strategic Open Space
1375 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Further justification is required as to why one hectare of Informal Open Space is equivalent to five hectares of Strategic Open Space. Why is five hectares of Strategic Open Space requested? The report produced on the availability of Strategic Open Space suggests that the current level of availability is 1.1 hectares per 1000 people. Circular 5/2005 is quite clear that planning obligations should not be used as a 'betterment levy'. Planning obligations should only be used to secure contributions that are reasonably related to the scale of the development proposed.	Concerns noted. All references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Remove all references to Strategic Open Space.
1204 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	Support	The Society supports the Open Space Standards and wishes no further reductions of these Standards in the Cambridge Context. This to ensure the Green Infrastructure Character of the City is preserved and extended to all the new areas of the the City and quality green space environments are available to those new citizen.	Support noted. However, all references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Remove all references to Strategic Open Space
1149 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This is consistent with Proposed Changes policies ENV1 and C2.	Support noted. However, all references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Remove all references to Strategic Open Space.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Table 2</i>				
1231 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Table 2 is not consistent with 'Table 2: Application of the Standards' (page 130 of the Local Plan) and should be amended. The Family Student Housing/Indoor Sports Facilities: "full provision" should be accompanied with two asterisks and not one as shown. Strategic Open Space should not be included in Table 2 as discussed in relation to our comments made on Table 1. This is not included in the Local Plan Table 2 and is therefore not consistent with that document.	Concerns noted. Table 2 will be revised to replicate the similar table in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. All references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Delete all references to Strategic Open Space Revise Table 2 to replicate Table 2: Applications of Standards in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006
1150 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This is consistent with Proposed Changes policies ENV1 and C2.	Support noted.	
<i>3.3.11</i>				
1332 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	Planning obligations in respect of open space provision should not, as a matter of course, be applied to non-residential development. This approach is not supported by policies in the Local Plan. Local Plan Policy 3/8 refers solely to residential development although the accompanying text indicates that open space standards may apply to non-residential development and that these requirements will be set out in master plans or design briefs. The Planning Obligation Strategy should make it clear that open space requirements in non-residential developments will be identified through master plans and design briefs and provision required only in accordance with the requirements set out in those documents.	Concerns noted. It should be noted that the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD does not set policy. It supports policy set out in the Local Plan and should not reiterate the entire content of the Local Plan.	
1151 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This is consistent with Proposed Changes policies ENV1 and C2.	Support noted.	
1208 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	Support	The Society strongly supports the provision of suitable Open Space areas to areas of retail and employment areas and community facilities etc and in particular in relation to Addenbrookes Hospital and 2020 extensions, where the Society considers that there is an existing underprovision and thus is in high need of being rectified as part of the proposed developments.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.3.12</i>				
1232 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	<p>The reference to Strategic Open Space is not consistent with the Local Plan and should be removed from this paragraph.</p> <p>In relation to Informal Open Space, no reference is made in the guidance to how much open space should be provided on the sites described. Guidance needs to be produced to clarify this matter. In addition, the number of units included does not allow for developments for example which are solely one-bedroom units. The SPD should be sufficiently flexible to allow for different forms of development and this should be reflected in the text of the SPD.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. All references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.</p> <p>With regards to informal open space, guidance is provided in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 on the expected amount of open space provision per 1,000 people. It is not considered that the Council can provide prescriptive information on individual sites within the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as this will depend on the individual planning applications that come forward and their densities.</p> <p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is not a standalone document and should be read with the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.</p>	Delete all references to Strategic Open Space.
1376 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	<p>The City Council should make it clear how the provision of strategic space makes individual development proposals acceptable and also how the provision of strategic open space is directly related to the proposed development. There is very little evidence of new open spaces being provided in the built-up areas of the city. Therefore it is likely that planning obligations will be used for improvement. There are local authority funding streams for the maintenance and management of these spaces already. The obligation requirements should be transparent and specify what additional benefits are expected over and above the normal maintenance and management arrangements and how these directly relate to the proposed development.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. All references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The Council is committed to new provision, but in a built up area this is not always possible. In these instances, contributions may be made to maintain and improve existing open spaces affected by further development in the surrounding area.</p>	Delete all references to Strategic Open Space

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.3.13				
1304 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to the Council's requirement for a commuted sum to the City Council based on the cost of maintenance and management for a period of 12 years. This should be amended to say a period of 10 years.	Concern noted. Circular 05/2005 makes it clear within paragraph B18 that it acceptable to ask for maintenance contributions as part of a planning obligations strategy. In addition, the Planning Obligations Practice Guide (CLG, 2006) also makes it clear at paragraph 2.15 that it is appropriate to specify a reasonable period for maintenance contributions within an SPD. It is the Council's experience that with regards to the maintenance of open space, a period of 12 years is most appropriate, and this approach has been taken on a number of sites and is contained within the Council's 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy.	
1511 - Environment Agency (Mr Adam Ireland) [214]	Object	3.3.13 refers to maintenance of on-site provision. This is a commuted sum based on the cost of maintenance and management for a period of 12 years following adoption. This refers to Appendix 3, which should be Appendix C.	Concerns noted. Appendix 3 will be amended to read as the relevant appendix (B with the deletion of the existing Appendix B)	Amend Appendix 3 to read as Appendix B
1377 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Circular 05/2005 is quite clear. Where an asset is intended for wider public use the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated that arise after the developer has made a contribution should normally be borne by the authority in which the asset is to be invested. Where the facilities are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the development, it may then be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance. Appendix 3 does not make the calculation of costs clear.	Disagree. Circular 05/2005 makes it clear within paragraph B18 that it acceptable to ask for maintenance contributions as part of a planning obligations strategy. In addition, the Planning Obligations Practice Guide (CLG, 2006) also makes it clear at paragraph 2.15 that it is appropriate to specify a reasonable period for maintenance contributions within an SPD. It should also be noted that in referring to paragraph 2.5 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, the objector has missed out the reference at the start of the paragraph that where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance. Elements of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD must not be read in isolation, but the document should be read as a whole.	
1233 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Appendix 3 should read Appendix C.	Concerns noted. Appendix 3 will be amended to read as the relevant appendix (B with the deletion of the existing Appendix B)	Amend Appendix 3 to read as "Appendix B"
3.3.14				
1234 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Appendix 3 should read Appendix C.	Concerns noted. Appendix 3 will be amended to read as the relevant appendix (B with the deletion of the existing Appendix B)	Amend Appendix 3 to read Appendix B
1341 - Fairview New Homes Ltd [224]	Object	It is acknowledged that Circular 05/2005 encourages the use of standard charges and formulae to give greater	Concern noted. The purpose of this paragraph is to provide developers with clarity from the outset as to what level of	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>certainty to developers. However, in stating figures, the Council should only use indicative targets or examples and should not state required amounts. The use of obligations in this way could stifle smaller developments coming forward. Fairview therefore request that an additional paragraph should be added on each of the above listed topic that clearly states that these are possible guide levels of contribution only.</p> <p>Although Circular 05/2005 states that a planning obligation can be used to mitigate a development's impact, it has to relate to the site. Fairview request that it is made clear that contributions for the above listed uses should all be applied on a site-by-site basis.</p>	<p>contributions might be sought towards open space. The paragraph does not state that these figures will be required but that they will be sought. The exact amount that will be sought towards open space will be negotiated on a case by case basis having regard to the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.</p>	
1379 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	<p>The cost of maintenance should not be included. Circular 5/2005 makes it quite clear where an asset is intended for wider public use the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developers contribution should normally be borne by the authority in which the asset is to be invested. As the off-site contributions for informal open space are intended mostly for improvements to spaces already maintained and managed then a justified account of the extra costs associated with maintenance over and above the current level should be provided. Also, extrapolating from Table 3, it takes £196,250 to provide and maintain one hectare of informal open space and £98,800 to provide and maintain one hectare of strategic open space. Why is there such a significant discrepancy between the figures?</p>	<p>Disagree. Circular 05/2005 makes it clear within paragraph B18 that it acceptable to ask for maintenance contributions as part of a planning obligations strategy. In addition, the Planning Obligations Practice Guide (CLG, 2006) also makes it clear at paragraph 2.15 that it is appropriate to specify a reasonable period for maintenance contributions within an SPD. It should also be noted that in referring to paragraph 2.5 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, the objector has missed out the reference at the start of the paragraph that where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance. Elements of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD must not be read in isolation, but the document should be read as a whole.</p> <p>With reference to strategic open space, due to lack of evidence base from Cambridgeshire County Council and the removal of strategic open space standards from South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document, all references to strategic open space have been removed from the SPD.</p>	
1600 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>It is unclear as to where precisely the policy justification exists for seeking 12 years maintenance payments, which is considered contrary to Circular 5/05.</p> <p>The Council itself refers in paragraph 2.5 of the text to the Circular's comments on maintenance payments. The reference to 12 years maintenance should therefore be</p>	<p>Disagree. Circular 05/2005 makes it clear within paragraph B18 that it acceptable to ask for maintenance contributions as part of a planning obligations strategy. In addition, the Planning Obligations Practice Guide (CLG, 2006) also makes it clear at paragraph 2.15 that it is appropriate to specify a reasonable period for maintenance contributions within an SPD. The 12 year maintenance period is</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		deleted as it is contrary to national policy and also has no local statutory policy justification.	established practice in Cambridge and is identified in the Council's 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy. It should also be noted that in referring to paragraph 2.5 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, the objector has missed out the reference at the start of the paragraph that where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance. Elements of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD must not be read in isolation, but the document should be read as a whole.	

Table 3

1235 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Table 3 should be revised in light of the comments made in relation to Appendix C by Ashwell Group. [Text of rep on Appendix C: "Planning Obligation Strategy SPD: 3. Informal Open Space. In relation to the costings for 0.8 ha site, the areas attached to those elements to be supplied equate to 0.92 hectares of space and not 0.8 hectares. Therefore the amount required is too much and should be reduced accordingly."]	Concerns noted. Table 3 and Appendix C have been updated in order to ensure consistency.	
1380 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	The cost of maintenance should not be included. Circular 5/2005 makes it quite clear where an asset is intended for wider public use the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developers contribution should normally be borne by the authority in which the asset is to be invested. As the off-site contributions for informal open space are intended mostly for improvements to spaces already maintained and managed then a justified account of the extra costs associated with maintenance over and above the current level should be provided. Also, extrapolating from Table 3, it takes £196,250 to provide and maintain one hectare of informal open space and £98,800 to provide and maintain one hectare of strategic open space. Why is there such a significant discrepancy between the figures?	Disagree. Circular 05/2005 makes it clear within paragraph B18 that it acceptable to ask for maintenance contributions as part of a planning obligations strategy. In addition, the Planning Obligations Practice Guide (CLG, 2006) also makes it clear at paragraph 2.15 that it is appropriate to specify a reasonable period for maintenance contributions within an SPD. It should also be noted that in referring to paragraph 2.5 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, the objector has missed out the reference at the start of the paragraph that where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance. Elements of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD must not be read in isolation, but the document should be read as a whole. With reference to strategic open space, due to lack of evidence base from Cambridgeshire County Council and the removal of strategic open space standards from South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1601 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>Relating population to the number of bedrooms in setting out the standards for residential development would significantly over-estimate the new population. It will considerably exceed average household sizes within the City. It is stated that Cambridgeshire County Council has a standard for provision in relation to Strategic Open Space. However, unless there is a statutory planning policy to which this relates, it is inappropriate to refer to it in the SPD.</p> <p>It should instead be based upon actual evidence of local household sizes taken from the Census and population updates. In order to comply with Circular 5/05 there must be an actual link between the reality on the ground and open space contributions being sought.</p> <p>Reference is also made to the standards set out in Appendix 1 of the Adopted Local Plan. It is then stated that in addition, Cambridgeshire County Council has a standard for provision in relation to Strategic Open Space. However, unless there is a statutory planning policy to which this relates, it is inappropriate to refer to it in the SPD.</p>	<p>Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document, all references to strategic open space have been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>Concerns noted. However, these multipliers are in line with those adopted in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Any rates based on the last Census would be out of date given the length of time, which has elapsed since the last Census in 2001. Furthermore, the rates of occupation in existing housing stock may not accurately reflect the occupation rates of new housing stock.</p> <p>All references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.</p>	Delete all references to Strategic Open Space
1518 - Sport England (Mr Philip Raiswell) [210]	Object	<p>We note that you have used Sport England Facility Costings to help with the calculation of facility costs. Please be aware that these costings are updated on a regular basis and the 2nd Quarter 2007 figures should be available shortly. Does the SPD make allowances for ongoing increases in costs for sports facilities and other community facilities? If not, will the SPD be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that these costings are up to date and reflect likely increases?</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Costs have been updated using the most recently available information. A reference. Information on the Council's index-linking approach is contained in Section 6 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.</p>	
1353 - Fairview New Homes Ltd [224]	Object	<p>It is acknowledged that Circular 05/2005 encourages the use of standard charges and formulae to give greater certainty to developers. However, in stating figures, the Council should only use indicative targets or examples and should not state required amounts. The use of obligations in this way could stifle smaller developments coming forward. Fairview therefore request that an additional paragraph should be added on each of the above listed topic that clearly states that these are possible guide levels of contribution only.</p>	<p>Concern noted. The purpose of this paragraph is to provide developers with clarity from the outset as to what level of contributions might be sought towards open space. The paragraph does not state that these figures will be required but that they will be sought. The exact amount that will be sought towards open space will be negotiated on a case by case basis having regard to the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Although Circular 05/2005 states that a planning obligation can be used to mitigate a development's impact, it has to relate to the site. Fairview request that it is made clear that contributions for the above listed uses should all be applied on a site-by-site basis.		
<i>3.3.16</i>				
1486 - Dr A H Charnley [474]	Object	A number of clubs or/and groups use the Nightingale Ave Park. Some 25 varieties of birds have been identified plus a rare orchid. The nature of green meadow land makes such diversity possible. Hard surface games areas exist at the nearby Netherhall specialist sports school. Any reduction of the grassland by permanent building will mean that some will not have their essential space. Which is to be eliminated? The Asian Cricketers? The Chinese footballers? The children flying their kites?	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1520 - Mrs E.C Charnley [481]	Object	Nightingale Avenue Park is the nearest, and only green space available to the many patients, visitors and staff at Addenbrooke's Hospital. It is a Regional asset and the city should behave responsibly and a 'trustee' of this asset.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Table 4</i>				
1645 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) Limited [243]	Object	<p>The SPD appears to favour the pooling of contributions and a hierarchy of spending of S106 monies. For example, in respect of open space expenditure, Table 4 implies that where there is no opportunity to spend monies assigned to provision for children and teenagers within the vicinity of the site, that the monies would be spent on 'facilities that would benefit residents from across the city'. This is a common theme/approach in the SPD.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that contributions should not be sought as a 'betterment levy', in my view the approach of the SPD fails test (iii) of paragraph B5 of the Circular as such obligations would not ensure that the monies would be spent on a facility directly related to the proposed development, i.e. a geographical link (also see para B8). There should be a clear audit trail between the contribution made and the mitigation provided, the drafting of the SPD does not appear to ensure this transparency and impact mitigation. In our view, to provide an appropriate degree of certainty and transparency the wording of the obligation should be such that it expressly states, where possible, the facility or project/scheme in respect of which the monies will be spent.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. However, Cambridge is a compact City. Experience indicates that where a facility is of a sufficient scale or is unique, i.e. BMX facilities or climbing boulders, families with young children and older children and teenagers will be willing to travel a greater distance to those facilities. Whilst it is recognised that it is preferable to spend monies in close proximity to the development, this is not always possible. This approach is not considered to fail the requirements of Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>With regards to the precise wording of planning obligations, this should be dealt with on a case by case basis and is not a matter for the SPD.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.3.17 1236 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	This SPD cannot rely on superseded SPG. Some of the schemes identified in the attached list are either refurbishments or improvements to existing sites and S106 money should not be used either to supplement or instead of the Council's maintenance budget for these facilities.	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighborhood (IYN) is a annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert appropriate text into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	
<i>3.3.18</i>				
1237 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Where pooled contributions are used to provide open space, projects should be identified in published annual monitoring reports. Sums collected and in the pool ready to be used on specific projects should be made public in the interests of clarity and openness.	Concern noted. Section 5 on Monitoring makes reference to the compilation of annual planning obligations monitoring reports on receipts and expenditure.	
1498 - Mrs Christine Clancey [478]	Object	Stated policies to protect green spaces are being contradicted by other Council policies to hard surface and intensify use instead of creating new green spaces. The Council should not be allowing revenue levied for provision of informal open space to finance projects which reduce existing green space. Payment in lieu and commuted payments should reflect city land values. Otherwise developers will always take the cheaper option and Council will be unable to afford new open space. Consultation with residents is advocated but ignored. Biodiversity and wildlife strategy have no credence. The Council's policy of using green space to site hard surfaced enclosed sports installation is unsustainable, leading to loss of green space.	Development is not permitted by the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. In addition to protecting and enhancing existing areas of open space, the Council requires the creation of extensive new areas of public open space as a result of the development occurring in the Areas of Major Change.	
1381 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Ten years is much longer than normal. If a scheme can not be identified and is not relevant to the application when it is determined then it does not accord with Circular 05/2005 and developer contributions should not be held for that period. Have any of these longer-term projects been identified and justified? In these cases, why should maintenance payments be made at the outset? If the need is proven for maintenance payments they should be paid only when the project identified in the S106 agreement is complete.	This approach is considered appropriate for inclusion within planning obligations as it is established practice carried through from the Council's 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.5 Community Facilities</i>				
1525 - Cambridgeshire PCT (Mr Ian Burns) [917]	Object	We commend the emphasis that is placed on the need for Community facilities. Along with this should also be the potential for contributions towards Community development. This has been shown to be particularly important for new communities and where integration with an existing community is required. Community development is a vital factor in preventing and reducing inequalities and in building social capital.	Support for the provision of community facilities noted. With regards to the potential for contributions towards community development, this is something that would need to be negotiated on a case by case basis bearing in mind the tests set out in Circular 05/2005. Many developments may not be of a scale to warrant such contributions. However, contributions towards the provision of community development officers are being sought for the urban extensions, given their scale. Given that the examples of what contributions could be sought given within the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD are not exhaustive, it is felt that specific reference to contributions towards community development is not required.	
1493 - Cambridge Older People's Enterprise (Mr Robert Boorman) [477]	Object	Section 106 monies could be used to subsidise the provision of some of these socially beneficial projects and perhaps leasing or renting facilities could generate some income to support the running of community facilities.	Concern noted. However, in line with national policy related to planning obligations as set out in Circular 05/2005, obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following five tests: 1) relevant to planning; 2) Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms; 3) directly related to the proposed development; 4) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and 5) Reasonable in all other respects.	Planning contributions towards community facilities are commonly sought, but such contributions need to be in line with the five tests set out above. The use of S106 monies to subsidise the provision of socially beneficial projects for the elderly that are not directly related to the development proposed are unlikely to meet these tests.
1527 - Cambridgeshire PCT (Mr Ian Burns) [917]	Object	Health is such an important factor of any community and in particular to achieving many of the objectives set out in the Local Plan, that there should be a specific section in the document relating to health and not just incorporate it into the section on Community facilities. In considering whether contributions will be sought towards the provision of health services, the Council should liaise with their local NHS Primary Care Trust and other relevant agencies. They should give consideration to relevant health documents such as the Strategic Delivery Plan (March 2007), the Strategic Services Delivery Plan (currently under development) and Local Health Service Needs Assessment	Concern noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		(due to be published June 2007) . In assessing whether contributions should be required, various factors need to be considered including demand for new services created by development and whether existing facilities can absorb the new patients and /or users.		
1521 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [485]	Support	We support the general proposals contained within the document and are pleased to see section 3.5 Community Facilities and 3.5.16	Support noted.	
3.5.1				
1398 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	The general definition of what is meant by community facilities is unclear and reference to the list of activities contained within Class D1 to the Town and Country (Use Classes) Order unnecessarily complicates matters especially since the provision of public libraries, for example, is covered in the education and life-long learning section. In our view the provision of community facilities should be focused upon the provision of health care facilities, the development of community centres, public halls, meeting places and places of worship.	Concerns noted. Whilst the definition of community facilities given in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD replicates the definition adopted in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, paragraph 3.5.4 will be strengthened to ensure clarity relating to the provision of information on requirements for education and life-long learning being contained in sub-section 3.3 of this SPD.	Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.5.4 to read "Provision for education and life-long learning is discussed in Sub-section 3.3 of this SPD. As such, to avoid double-counting, monies towards community facilities will not be spent on provision of education and life-long learning facilities."
3.5.2				
1399 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	The general definition of what is meant by community facilities is unclear and reference to the list of activities contained within Class D1 to the Town and Country (Use Classes) Order unnecessarily complicates matters especially since the provision of public libraries, for example, is covered in the education and life-long learning section. In our view the provision of community facilities should be focused upon the provision of health care facilities, the development of community centres, public halls, meeting places and places of worship.	Concerns noted. Whilst the definition of community facilities given in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD replicates the definition adopted in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, paragraph 3.5.4 will be strengthened to ensure clarity relating to the provision of information on requirements for education and life-long learning being contained in sub-section 3.4 of this SPD.	Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.5.4 to read "Provision for education and life-long learning is discussed in Sub-section 3.4 of this SPD. As such, to avoid double-counting, monies towards community facilities will not be spent on provision of education and life-long learning facilities."
3.5.3				
1523 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [485]	Object	As arts and cultural facilities would include theatre, we suggest that for factual clarity their sui generis status is included within item 3.5.3 and as we are concerned and wish to be assured that theatre buildings benefit appropriately under the terms of S106 Agreements..	Concerns noted. However, the definition of community facilities given in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD replicates the definition adopted in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. At the present time, the Council does not consider that there is a sufficient local evidence base for inclusion of theatres within the community facilities section of this document.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1400 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	The general definition of what is meant by community facilities is unclear and reference to the list of activities contained within Class D1 to the Town and Country (Use Classes) Order unnecessarily complicates matters especially since the provision of public libraries, for example, is covered in the education and life-long learning section. In our view the provision of community facilities should be focused upon the provision of health care facilities, the development of community centres, public halls, meeting places and places of worship.	Concerns noted. Whilst the definition of community facilities given in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD replicates the definition adopted in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, paragraph 3.5.4 will be strengthened to ensure clarity relating to the provision of information on requirements for education and life-long learning being contained in sub-section 3.4 of this SPD.	Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.5.4 to read "Provision for education and life-long learning is discussed in Sub-section 3.4 of this SPD. As such, to avoid double-counting, monies towards community facilities will not be spent on provision of education and life-long learning facilities."
<i>3.5.4</i>				
1401 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	The general definition of what is meant by community facilities is unclear and reference to the list of activities contained within Class D1 to the Town and Country (Use Classes) Order unnecessarily complicates matters especially since the provision of public libraries, for example, is covered in the education and life-long learning section. In our view the provision of community facilities should be focused upon the provision of health care facilities, the development of community centres, public halls, meeting places and places of worship.	Concerns noted. Whilst the definition of community facilities given in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD replicates the definition adopted in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, paragraph 3.5.4 will be strengthened to ensure clarity relating to the provision of information on requirements for education and life-long learning being contained in sub-section 3.4 of this SPD.	Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.5.4 to read "Provision for education and life-long learning is discussed in Sub-section 3.4 of this SPD. As such, to avoid double-counting, monies towards community facilities will not be spent on provision of education and life-long learning facilities."
<i>3.5.5</i>				
1245 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The list of documents included at the end of this paragraph is substantially out of date (apart from the last bullet point). The SPD should be based on up-to-date practice and research documents providing a robust data set upon which to make contributions.	Concern noted. The list of documents provided at paragraph 3.5.5 will be updated as necessary. It should however, be noted that this list is not intended to be exhaustive and that such studies will be routinely updated to ensure a robust evidence base.	Update list of documents provided at paragraph 3.5.5

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.5.8 1334 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	<p>There is a concern that this section of the report is, at least in part, more concerned with 'determining areas of existing deficiency' and 'sustaining existing services' than meeting new needs. Planning obligations can only be required to meet the needs arising from new development and reference to sustaining existing services should be deleted.</p> <p>'Pump priming' funding should be limited to a maximum period of 5 years. If the facility becomes a viable operation within that time, pump priming funding should cease. There should be a reciprocal commitment on behalf of the relevant public authority to keep the facility open for a period no less than the period for which pump priming funding was provided after that funding ceases.</p>	<p>Concern noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is clear that improvements to existing facilities will only be required where this directly relates to meeting new or additional needs that are a direct result of development. In some instances it will be more appropriate to improve existing facilities as opposed to providing new facilities, particularly for smaller developments that do not have additional land to provide for new facilities.</p> <p>With regards to 'pump priming' paragraph 3.5.11 of the SPD makes reference to the likelihood of pump-priming contributions being required for at least the first five years of operation of a new facility, particularly for developments within the Areas of Major Change. Further information regarding pump priming is contained within Circular 05/2005, which states that "where contributions to the initial support ("pump priming") of new facilities are necessary, these should reflect the time-lag between the provision of the new facility and its inclusion in public sector funding streams or its ability to recover its own costs..." As such it is considered that this level of detail should not be included in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.</p>	
1402 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	<p>The suggestion that developers should fund the refurbishment of existing facilities is not accepted given that the maintenance and management of existing buildings should be met from current revenue accounts.</p>	<p>Concern noted. However the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is clear that improvements to existing facilities will only be required where this directly relates to meeting new or additional needs that are a direct result of development. In some instances it will be more appropriate to improve existing facilities as opposed to providing new facilities, particularly for smaller developments that do not have additional land to provide for new facilities.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.5.10</i>				
1607 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The text states that in respect of community facilities all new dwelling units are required to mitigate their impact, either through some form of on-site provision for large-scale developments or through the use of financial contributions towards off-site provision for smaller developments. However, there is no statutory requirements stating that such payments will be required in respect of all residential developments. Indeed to do so would contravene the tests of reasonableness set out in Circular 5/05. Furthermore, it would be a huge administrative burden and slow down the whole planning process.	The requirement for new development to contribute towards the provision of community facilities is set out in Policy 5/14 of the Local Plan (2006), for which the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD provides additional guidance. The precise nature of contributions towards community facilities will be negotiated on a case by case basis having regards to the tests set out in Circular 05/2005. Where appropriate, on-site provision will be sought, and in situations where on-site provision is not feasible and for most residential developments comprising less than 100 units, financial contributions will be sought for off-site provision as set out in the SPD.	
1403 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	This paragraph should be reworded to say "In view of the likely impact that any new residential development proposal may have on existing community facilities that proposal will be required to mitigate any likely impacts through some form of on-site provision or through a financial contribution towards off-site provision".	Concern noted. However it is felt that the suggested wording does not add clarity to the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD and that no change to the existing text in paragraph 3.5.10 is necessary.	
1154 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	The provision of community facilities is consistent with policy SS2 that requires new development to contribute to improving the quality of life by making suitable provision for the needs of the health and social services sectors.	Support noted.	
<i>3.5.11</i>				
1177 - TEAG (Mr Peter Dawson) [343]	Object	Have some concerns about the provision of community facilities in the Southern Fringe. Does not reflect Policy 9/3k of the 2006 City Plan. Paragraph 3.5.11 needs redrafting to reflect this requirement of integration.	Concern noted. Further information regarding Planning Obligations requirements for the Areas of Major Change, including the Southern Fringe, is provided within section 4 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. Paragraph 4.6 of this section makes specific reference to the types of on-site infrastructure likely to be required at the Areas of Major Change including community facilities such as community centres and youth provision. With regards to the need to make reference to the need for integration of new community facilities with existing communities, this requirement is set out in Policy 9/3k of the Local Plan. As such it is considered that this requirement does not need to be repeated in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.	
1311 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to the Council's threshold that developments comprising 100 units or more should hold early discussion with the Primary Care Trust to assess the impact on existing GP facilities within the local area. This threshold should be deleted and be based on the level of population	Disagree. The Council believes it is important to engage in constructive discussion with developers in order to speed up the application process and improve outcomes.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1197 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company (Miss Helen Moore) [452]	Object	and not unit numbers. Amend to read: "...Depending on the scale of the development, on site-provision could range from a new dedicated community centre for the developments within the Areas of Major Change to a community house/flat or community rooms or café for other large developments. The dual use of education facilities for wider community use may also be considered as an alternative means of providing local community facilities."	Concern noted. While dual use of education facilities can be a mechanisms by which community facilities are provided in an area, this should be discussed with the Council on a site by site basis. It is felt that this level of detail is not necessary within the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.	
1608 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The reference to at least 5 years maintenance should be deleted as it is contrary to national policy and it also has no apparent local statutory policy justification. The Council itself refers in paragraph 2.5 of the text of Circular 5/05 comments on maintenance payments. The reference to at least 5 years maintenance should therefore be deleted as it is contrary to national policy and it also has no apparent local statutory policy justification.	Disagree. Circular 05/2005 makes it clear within paragraph B18 that it acceptable to ask for maintenance contributions as part of a planning obligations strategy. In addition, the Planning Obligations Practice Guide (CLG, 2006) also makes it clear at paragraph 2.15 that it is appropriate to specify a reasonable period for maintenance contributions within an SPD. It should also be noted that in referring to paragraph 2.5 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, the objector has missed out the reference at the start of the paragraph that where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance. Elements of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD must not be read in isolation, but the document should be read as a whole.	
1310 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to the first sentence of this paragraph which states that residential developments comprising 100 units of more should hold early discussion with the City Council's head of Community development. This threshold should be deleted.	Disagree. The Council believes it is important to engage in constructive discussion with developers in order to speed up the application process and improve outcomes.	
1155 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	The provision of community facilities is consistent with policy SS2 that requires new development to contribute to improving the quality of life by making suitable provision for the needs of the health and social services sectors.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.5.13				
1528 - Cambridgeshire PCT (Mr Ian Burns) [917]	Object	<p>The strategy needs to recognise the potential need for contributions to Health services and infrastructure and should not be limited to Primary healthcare facilities. The range of services that needs to be considered includes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Care: GP Services. • Intermediate Care: Day Places and Beds • Acute Facilities: elective, non-elective and day care beds. • Mental Health Services • Revenue Contributions: Covering running costs of the above and the full range of community health services. <p>There are also a number of other types of health service provision that include tertiary (or specialist services) which usually have a much larger catchment area than the local area covered by a specific development.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. It is considered that there is currently an insufficient evidence base to support the blanket requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit towards primary care facilities on schemes of 100 dwelling units or more. Rather than include a standard charge in the SPD, it is proposed to delete this and include reference to the potential for planning obligations to support primary care facilities on a site by site basis in the section that deals with other potential development specific planning obligation requirements. This does not prevent contributions from being sought for such facilities if the PCT can demonstrate a specific need at the time of a planning application or during pre-application discussion. In addition, robust processes would need to be in place first to ensure full accountability and transparency of process in relation to expenditure of financial contributions, given that these would be outside the Council's control.</p>	<p>Delete requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit on schemes of 100 units or more and insert reference to 'Primary care facilities (5/12, 5/13, 5/14)' in the bullet pointed list within 'Other Potential Development-Specific Planning Requirements'.</p>
1529 - Cambridgeshire PCT (Mr Ian Burns) [917]	Object	<p>The use of a threshold of 100 dwellings is somewhat arbitrary and inconsistent with the approaches to education, libraries and lifelong learning. It also ignores the cumulative impact of developments under that threshold.</p> <p>If a threshold should be set in terms of site size and/or number of dwellings, we feel it should be at a much lower level and possibly in line with that proposed for education, libraries and lifelong learning. Planning Circular 05/2005 specifically provides for pooled contributions where an individual development will have some impact but is not sufficient to justify the need for a discrete piece of infrastructure. The cumulative impact of small developments on the requirement for health facilities and the provision of health services should thus be taken into account.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. It is considered that there is currently an insufficient evidence base to support the blanket requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit towards primary care facilities on schemes of 100 dwelling units or more. Rather than include a standard charge in the SPD, it is proposed to delete this and include reference to the potential for planning obligations to support primary care facilities on a site by site basis in the section that deals with other potential development specific planning obligation requirements. This does not prevent contributions from being sought for such facilities if the PCT can demonstrate a specific need at the time of a planning application or during pre-application discussion. In addition, robust processes would need to be in place first to ensure full accountability and transparency of process in relation to expenditure of financial contributions, given that these would be outside the Council's control.</p>	<p>Delete requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit on schemes of 100 units or more and insert reference to 'Primary care facilities (5/12, 5/13, 5/14)' in the bullet pointed list within 'Other Potential Development-Specific Planning Requirements'.</p>
3.5.14				
1198 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company (Miss Helen Moore) [452]	Object	<p>Amend to read: "In those instances, such as within the Areas of Major Change, where new dedicated or co-located healthcare provision is required, the planning obligations requirements may include the provision of free serviced land and the capital cost of the new facility and its fitting out, if not built by the developer." To provide flexibility in terms of delivery and procurement.</p>	<p>Concern noted. While the co-location of health care facilities can be a mechanism by which such facilities are provided in an area, this should be discussed with the Council on a site by site basis. It is felt that this level of detail is not necessary within the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.5.16				
1199 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company (Miss Helen Moore) [452]	Object	<p>Amend to read: "These will be assessed on a site by site basis, through the master-planning process for the individual developments and taking into account other site development costs".</p> <p>To ensure that the site requirements when considered as a whole do not compromise the delivery of the site.</p>	<p>Concern noted. However, it is felt that the suggested wording does not add anything to the clarity of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. Planning contributions will be negotiated on a site by site basis, taking into account the five tests as set out in Circular 05/2005. The consideration of impact on the overall viability of development is inherent within these tests. In addition, the Local Plan allows for viability considerations to be taken into account as part of the planning application/planning obligation process, particularly on the large-scale developments within the Areas of Major Change. As such, it is felt that this level of detail should not be included in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.</p>	
1609 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>Some of the items listed for which financial contributions might be sought, seem to lack any specific statutory planning policy justification. They also seem to fail the tests of reasonableness set out in Circular 5/05.</p>	<p>Disagree. The list of facilities provided within this paragraph fall within the definition of community facilities as set out in the adopted Local Plan. It should also be noted that this paragraph relates to large-scale developments, in particular the areas of major change, which will lead to the development of new communities in Cambridge. This paragraph lists the types of facilities, which in the Council's experience, are required to mitigate impacts on community infrastructure as a result of new large-scale development. The exact nature of the facilities provided will be negotiated on a case by case basis and will be in line with the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.</p>	
1522 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [485]	Support	<p>We support the general proposals contained within the document..</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	
3.5.17				
1246 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	<p>A clear methodology for these contributions needs to be set out either in the SPD or appendix and its provenance shown to be robust. Without this justification, the figures are unreliable and do not meet the tests of Circular 05/05.</p>	<p>This approach was established in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy and has been used with success for six years. These costs have not materially changed and have been index-linked to reflect current costs.</p>	<p>Update costs on an index-linked basis.</p>
1343 - Fairview New Homes Ltd [224]	Object	<p>It is acknowledged that Circular 05/2005 encourages the use of standard charges and formulae to give greater certainty to developers. However, in stating figures, the Council should only use indicative targets or examples and should not state required amounts. The use of obligations in this way could stifle smaller developments coming forward. Fairview therefore request that an additional paragraph should be added on each of the above listed</p>	<p>Concern noted. The purpose of this paragraph is to provide developers with clarity from the outset as to what level of contributions might be sought towards community facilities. The paragraph does not state that these figures will be required but that they will be sought. The exact amount that will be sought towards community facilities will be negotiated on a case by case basis having regard to the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		topic that clearly states that these are possible guide levels of contribution only.		
		Although Circular 05/2005 states that a planning obligation can be used to mitigate a development's impact, it has to relate to the site. Fairview request that it is made clear that contributions for the above listed uses should all be applied on a site-by-site basis.		
1610 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The sums specified seem entirely arbitrary and lack the evidence base required under planning legislation. It is unclear as to where these financial sums specified actually arise from. They seem to be just a basis for obtaining monies for spending on general unspecified community facilities, and fail to take any account of the quantity and quality of actual existing provision within the areas being developed.	This approach was established in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy and has been used with success for six years. These costs have not materially changed and have been index-linked to reflect current costs.	Update costs on an index-linked basis.
1404 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	It is not clear how the rates per dwelling type have been determined and on what basis. Further information is required in order to provide the necessary transparency.	This approach was established in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy and has been used with success for six years. These costs have not materially changed and have been index-linked to reflect current costs.	Update costs on an index-linked basis.
3.5.18				
1247 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	There is no justification for coming to the figure of £1000 per dwelling in the first instance. The contribution should be graded depending on the size of dwelling and therefore the likely resultant population (which ultimately determines impact). A clear methodology for these contributions needs to be set out either in the SPD.	Concerns noted. It is considered that there is currently an insufficient evidence base to support the blanket requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit towards primary care facilities on schemes of 100 dwelling units or more. Rather than include a standard charge in the SPD, it is proposed to delete this and include reference to the potential for planning obligations to support primary care facilities on a site by site basis in the section that deals with other potential development specific planning obligation requirements. This does not prevent contributions from being sought for such facilities if the PCT can demonstrate a specific need at the time of a planning application or during pre-application discussion. In addition, robust processes would need to be in place first to ensure full accountability and transparency of process in relation to expenditure of financial contributions, given that these would be outside the Council's control.	Delete requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit on schemes of 100 units or more and insert reference to 'Primary care facilities (5/12, 5/13, 5/14)' in the bullet pointed list within 'Other Potential Development-Specific Planning Requirements'.
1183 - Smith Stuart Reynolds (Mr Geoff Bolton) [443]	Object	There is no explanation of how the formula charge has been calculated. This should be based on costed improvements which have been identified as necessary to meet the requirements of planned growth on sites allocated in the Local Plan.	Concerns noted. It is considered that there is currently an insufficient evidence base to support the blanket requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit towards primary care facilities on schemes of 100 dwelling units or more. Rather than include a standard charge in the SPD, it is	Delete requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit on schemes of 100 units or more and insert reference to 'Primary care facilities (5/12, 5/13, 5/14)' in the bullet pointed list

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1530 - Cambridgeshire PCT (Mr Ian Burns) [917]	Object	<p>The suggested contribution of £1000 per dwelling is a starting point for discussion and probably needs further consideration. A fairer figure could be higher or lower depending on a number of factors.</p> <p>There is no simple or consistent formula for calculating contributions for health services and infrastructure but there are modelling tools now emerging that could enable the Council and PCT to work together to calculate a reasonable contribution for each development. These tools include the NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit Planning Contribution Model produced in 2005 and currently undergoing further refinement.</p>	<p>proposed to delete this and include reference to the potential for planning obligations to support primary care facilities on a site by site basis in the section that deals with other potential development specific planning obligation requirements. This does not prevent contributions from being sought for such facilities if the PCT can demonstrate a specific need at the time of a planning application or during pre-application discussion. In addition, robust processes would need to be in place first to ensure full accountability and transparency of process in relation to expenditure of financial contributions, given that these would be outside the Council's control.</p> <p>Concerns noted. It is considered that there is currently an insufficient evidence base to support the blanket requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit towards primary care facilities on schemes of 100 dwelling units or more. Rather than include a standard charge in the SPD, it is proposed to delete this and include reference to the potential for planning obligations to support primary care facilities on a site by site basis in the section that deals with other potential development specific planning obligation requirements. This does not prevent contributions from being sought for such facilities if the PCT can demonstrate a specific need at the time of a planning application or during pre-application discussion. In addition, robust processes would need to be in place first to ensure full accountability and transparency of process in relation to expenditure of financial contributions, given that these would be outside the Council's control.</p>	<p>within 'Other Potential Development-Specific Planning Requirements'.</p> <p>Delete requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit on schemes of 100 units or more and insert reference to 'Primary care facilities (5/12, 5/13, 5/14)' in the bullet pointed list within 'Other Potential Development-Specific Planning Requirements'.</p>
1405 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	<p>It is not clear how the rates per dwelling type have been determined and on what basis. Further information is required in order to provide the necessary transparency.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. It is considered that there is currently an insufficient evidence base to support the blanket requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit towards primary care facilities on schemes of 100 dwelling units or more. Rather than include a standard charge in the SPD, it is proposed to delete this and include reference to the potential for planning obligations to support primary care facilities on a site by site basis in the section that deals with other potential development specific planning obligation requirements. This does not prevent contributions from being sought for such facilities if the PCT can demonstrate a specific need at the time of a planning application or during pre-application discussion. In addition, robust processes would need to be in place first to ensure full accountability and transparency of process in relation to expenditure of financial contributions, given that these would be outside the Council's control.</p>	<p>Delete requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit on schemes of 100 units or more and insert reference to 'Primary care facilities (5/12, 5/13, 5/14)' in the bullet pointed list within 'Other Potential Development-Specific Planning Requirements'.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1611 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The sums specified seem entirely arbitrary and lack the evidence base required under planning legislation. It is unclear as to where these financial sums specified actually arise from. They seem to be just a basis for obtaining monies for spending on general unspecified primary healthcare facilities, and fail to take any account of the quantity and quality of actual existing provision within the areas being developed.	Concerns noted. It is considered that there is currently an insufficient evidence base to support the blanket requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit towards primary care facilities on schemes of 100 dwelling units or more. Rather than include a standard charge in the SPD, it is proposed to delete this and include reference to the potential for planning obligations to support primary care facilities on a site by site basis in the section that deals with other potential development specific planning obligation requirements. This does not prevent contributions from being sought for such facilities if the PCT can demonstrate a specific need at the time of a planning application or during pre-application discussion. In addition, robust processes would need to be in place first to ensure full accountability and transparency of process in relation to expenditure of financial contributions, given that these would be outside the Council's control.	Delete requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit on schemes of 100 units or more and insert reference to 'Primary care facilities (5/12, 5/13, 5/14)' in the bullet pointed list within 'Other Potential Development-Specific Planning Requirements'.
1465 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	<p>The Trust will need to increase its in patient, out patient and support capacity to meet the increased demand for services arising from population increases.</p> <p>The NHS funding arrangements for Primary Care are the same as those for Secondary (hospital) Care. Provision is made within the document for developer contributions to primary care facilities. Similar provision should be made for secondary care services. This would be consistent with Circular 2005 /05. Paragraph B15 of the circular states that contributions should be sought "If a proposed development would give rise to the need for additional or expanded community infrastructure...". It is artificial to restrict healthcare contributions to PCT's. The Trust should be included in the range of stakeholders who can receive contributions as well.</p> <p>This approach has been adopted by a number of the London Councils that have adopted new Planning Obligations Strategies such as Croydon, Redbridge and Camden and these include the requirements of the NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU) guidance notes for establishing planning contributions from London developers. This guidance includes securing contributions from developers for hospital providers. The Trust would be looking to the Council to make similar arrangements in Cambridge.</p>	Concern noted. In the case of hospital infrastructure provision/improvements, it is not considered that this is a feasible option at the present time, given that Addenbrooke's hospital is a sub-regional facility and therefore it is considered that any standard charge relating to the funding of hospital infrastructure would need to be introduced as part of a wider sub-regional strategy, such as Variable Rate Tariff and Community Infrastructure Levy. In addition, there is a lack of detailed information available in relation to the nature of the facilities/infrastructure that such contributions would fund and whether these would be a legitimate use for Section 106 contributions, in accordance with the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.	
1466 - Cambridge University	Object	The Trust notes that (paragraph 3.5.18) the Council is	Concerns noted. It is considered that there is currently an	Delete requirement for £1,000 per

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]		proposing a contribution of £1,000 per dwelling for Primary Care facilities. The document does not set out the process through which this cost has been established and there does not appear to be any justification of the cost.	insufficient evidence base to support the blanket requirement for £1,000 per dwelling unit towards primary care facilities on schemes of 100 dwelling units or more. Rather than include a standard charge in the SPD, it is proposed to delete this and include reference to the potential for planning obligations to support primary care facilities on a site by site basis in the section that deals with other potential development specific planning obligation requirements. This does not prevent contributions from being sought for such facilities if the PCT can demonstrate a specific need at the time of a planning application or during pre-application discussion. In addition, robust processes would need to be in place first to ensure full accountability and transparency of process in relation to expenditure of financial contributions, given that these would be outside the Council's control.	dwelling unit on schemes of 100 units or more and insert reference to 'Primary care facilities (5/12, 5/13, 5/14)' in the bullet pointed list within 'Other Potential Development-Specific Planning Requirements'.
<i>3.5.19</i>				
1312 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to bullet point 5 in this paragraph and suggest that it is deleted from the list.	There is no fifth bullet point within this paragraph.	
1283 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	In paragraph 3.5.19, 'total affordable housing' is listed as an exemption to contributing towards community facilities. The County Council has a preference not to exclude 'total affordable housing' on the grounds that the residents moving to new developments from elsewhere in Cambridge should have the opportunity to use facilities new their new homes.	This approach was established in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy and also reflects the approach taken in many other Local Authorities. Exemptions are given as the Council is aware that future residents of new total affordable housing schemes are registered with Council as being in housing need and are existing residents of the City. Furthermore, it is recognised that the imposition of full planning obligations on total affordable housing schemes would be likely to lead to them being unviable.	
1612 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The text states that 'total' affordable housing provision will not be required to contribute towards community facility provision where it can be demonstrated that the occupiers of the scheme are already living elsewhere in Cambridge. The same text should apply to all residential developments. The impact of new residents on such facilities will be at least just as significant from affordable housing schemes as from private housing schemes.	This approach was established in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy and also reflects the approach taken in many other Local Authorities. Exemptions are given as the Council is aware that future residents of new total affordable housing schemes are registered with Council as being in housing need and are existing residents of the City. Furthermore, it is recognised that the imposition of full planning obligations on total affordable housing schemes would be likely to lead to them being unviable.	
1638 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) Limited [243]	Object	As to the formulae, with regard to education this seeks a standard charge per unit. Whilst we support the exclusion of 1-bedroom units from this standard charge, the Council's approach in respect of excluding affordable units is unjustified and inconsistent. The SPD states that only RSL schemes of 100% affordable housing that demonstrate that	This approach was established in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy and also reflects the approach taken in many other Local Authorities. Exemptions are given as the Council is aware that future residents of new total affordable housing schemes are registered with Council as being in housing need and are existing residents of the City.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>future residents will come from elsewhere in the city will be excluded from the requirement. The same exclusion applies in respect of community facilities, other than primary healthcare facilities.</p> <p>It is assumed that the Council provide this exclusion on the basis that the educational and community needs of the affordable units will already have been met, as they will be occupied by existing residents, therefore the exclusion avoids double counting. However, through the application of Policy 5/5 Affordable Housing it is likely that the Council will seek nomination rights for affordable housing units through S106 Agreements and accordingly existing residents will occupy the units. Alternatively, an RSL or other such delivery partner could agree to such a restriction. Clearly if an existing resident of the borough occupies an affordable unit, regardless of whether it is delivered through Policy 5/5, it should be excluded from the education and community facility contribution requirement. It is not clear therefore why this exclusion is so restricted and inconsistent.</p>	<p>Furthermore, it is recognised that the imposition of full planning obligations on total affordable housing schemes would be likely to lead to them being unviable.</p>	
<i>3.5.20</i>				
1406 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward [464])	Object	<p>In our view any expenditure on community facilities should be directly related to the proposed development. They should not therefore relate to other wider projects or programmes. Developers should only be required to make a one-off payment and if it is not expended within five years the amount should be refunded with interest.</p>	<p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is clear that improvements to existing facilities will only be required where this directly relates to meeting new or additional needs that are a direct result of development. In some instances it will be more appropriate to improve existing facilities as opposed to providing new facilities, particularly for smaller developments that do not have additional land to provide for new facilities.</p> <p>In terms of timescales and mechanisms for repayment of unspent monies, this issue is specifically referenced in paragraph B24 of Circular 05/2005. As such, it is considered that this level of detail should not be included in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. The timing of the rebate would depend on the precise wording of a legal agreement, which would be monitored by the Council and the developer.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.5.21</i>				
1407 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	In our view any expenditure on community facilities should be directly related to the proposed development. They should not therefore relate to other wider projects or programmes. Developers should only be required to make a one-off payment and if it is not expended within five years the amount should be refunded with interest.	<p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is clear that improvements to existing facilities will only be required where this directly relates to meeting new or additional needs that are a direct result of development. In some instances it will be more appropriate to improve existing facilities as opposed to providing new facilities, particularly for smaller developments that do not have additional land to provide for new facilities.</p> <p>In terms of timescales and mechanisms for repayment of unspent monies, this issue is specifically referenced in paragraph B24 of Circular 05/2005. As such, it is considered that this level of detail should not be included in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. The timing of the rebate would depend on the precise wording of a legal agreement, which would be monitored by the Council and the developer.</p>	
1613 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	Some of the items listed for which financial contributions might be sought seem to lack any specific statutory planning policy justification. They also seem to fail the tests of reasonableness set out in Circular 5/05.	<p>The list of facilities provided within this paragraph fall within the definition of community facilities as set out in the adopted Local Plan. The exact planning contributions required towards the provision of community facilities will be negotiated on a case by case basis bearing in mind the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>However, the projects listed in this paragraph have been deleted due to the time which has elapsed since the consultation took place on the draft SPD. The process by which schemes are selected is detailed in the amended paragraph.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.5.21 to remove projects and to read as follows:</p> <p>"Improvements to community facilities (other than primary healthcare facilities) are currently identified as projects which will help to meet the additional demands being placed upon community facilities by new development in the city. These projects are identified by the Head of Community Development and included in an annual Capital Plan. This Capital Plan is reviewed and agreed by Community Services Committee. If there is a particular project or options for development that relate to a specific part of the City, these proposals would be taken to the relevant Area Committee. As many of the projects will be delivered in partnership with community groups and the voluntary sector, detailed assessments/project appraisals will</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
				be carried out on proposals for funding individual projects by the Community Services Department before determining the extent of planning obligation contribution to be provided. Additional projects may be considered for funding with the permission of the relevant Executive Councillor and the Chair of the relevant Area Committee or Community Services Scrutiny Committee."
<i>3.5.22</i>				
1467 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	Paragraphs 3.5.22 and 5.14 explain that the local PCT will indicate to what project these contributions have been put. Our Trust would be pleased to give the same undertaking, and also to provide information to allow the Council to ensure transparency and accountability to the processes described in paragraph 5.6.	Noted.	
1408 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	In our view any expenditure on community facilities should be directly related to the proposed development. They should not therefore relate to other wider projects or programmes. Developers should only be required to make a one-off payment and if it is not expended within five years the amount should be refunded with interest.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is clear that improvements to existing facilities will only be required where this directly relates to meeting new or additional needs that are a direct result of development. In some instances it will be more appropriate to improve existing facilities as opposed to providing new facilities, particularly for smaller developments that do not have additional land to provide for new facilities. In terms of timescales and mechanisms for repayment of unspent monies, this issue is specifically referenced in paragraph B24 of Circular 05/2005. As such, it is considered that this level of detail should not be included in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. The timing of the rebate would depend on the precise wording of a legal agreement, which would be monitored by the Council and the developer.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.5.23</i>				
1409 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	In our view any expenditure on community facilities should be directly related to the proposed development. They should not therefore relate to other wider projects or programmes. Developers should only be required to make a one-off payment and if it is not expended within five years the amount should be refunded with interest.	<p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD is clear that improvements to existing facilities will only be required where this directly relates to meeting new or additional needs that are a direct result of development. In some instances it will be more appropriate to improve existing facilities as opposed to providing new facilities, particularly for smaller developments that do not have additional land to provide for new facilities.</p> <p>In terms of timescales and mechanisms for repayment of unspent monies, this issue is specifically referenced in paragraph B24 of Circular 05/2005. As such, it is considered that this level of detail should not be included in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. The timing of the rebate would depend on the precise wording of a legal agreement, which would be monitored by the Council and the developer.</p>	
1313 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	This paragraph should be amended to read as follows: "...As some of the larger projects identified may require contributions from a number of developments in order to generate sufficient funding. An agreed expenditure programme will need to be put in place and will be specified in planning obligations in order that sufficient funds can be built up to fund projects. Furthermore, the Council makes no reference to the requirement for any financial contributions to be returned to developers in the event that contributions are made towards specific infrastructure provision but the provision is not provided within an agreed timeframe.	Concern noted. However, it is considered that an expenditure period of ten years may be appropriate in some circumstances as larger projects may require pooled contributions from a number of developments for an identified scheme to be implemented. Given the potential need for use of planning obligations from a number of developments, it may not be possible for the planning obligations for each development to include an expenditure programme as that programme will inevitably be subject to change. The Council follows the advice provided in Circular 05/2005 and the Best Practice Guidance from the CLG (2006) and does not feel that it is necessary to reiterate national guidance in terms of returning unused financial contributions to developers.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.6 Waste</i>				
1459 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	<p>We have explained on many occasions that requiring NHS providers (Primary, Secondary and Tertiary care) to contribute to planning obligations would reduce the cash available for healthcare and therefore have a direct impact on the health of the local population.</p> <p>In the section on SCATP contributions (para 3.2.14) the document makes specific reference to hospital and Health Service providers explaining that these organisations will be considered flexibly as special cases. The Trust requests that similar wording is inserted into sections of the document concerning Open Space, Waste, Public Realm and Public Art. This would be consistent with the endorsement of the decision of the Cambridgeshire Horizons Board in April 2005 in the following wording:</p> <p>"Primary Healthcare Schemes and NHS Hospital and Clinical Service developments should not be required to contribute to other community infrastructure funding, provided that the services to be made available will serve the essential needs of the population of the Cambridge sub-region".</p>	Concern noted. NHS provider related developments will still have some impact, for example, trip generation, which will need mitigation. The exact planning obligations requirements will be negotiated on a case by case basis. To exempt such development from planning obligation requirements would be contrary to Circular 05/2005.	
1512 - Environment Agency (Mr Adam Ireland) [214]	Support	<p>The approach to contributions to waste issues is generally supported as it:</p> <p>States that new developments need to address their own implications, though where there is a need they should contribute to local and strategic facilities; and</p> <p>Intends to provide and integrate household waste and recycling receptacles.</p>	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.6.1</i>				
1284 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	The Policy Framework sub section should include reference to the relevant adopted policies in the Waste Local Plan and the emerging Waste Local Development Framework.	Noted. The document will be updated to reflect the up to date situation with regard waste policy in Cambridge. This can be followed through in paragraphs 3.6.5 & 3.6.9.	<p>Replace paragraph 3.6.5 with:</p> <p>"3.6.5 A key policy in the East of England Plan is set out below:</p> <p>- WM6 (Waste Management in Development) - Development should be designed and constructed to minimise the creation of waste, make maximum use of recycled materials and facilitate the collection, separation, sorting, recycling and recovery of waste arising from the development and surrounding areas, where appropriate.</p> <p>And replace the first sentence of paragraph 3.6.9 with:</p> <p>"3.6.9 Policy WM6 of the East of England Plan requires that major developments make provision for waste management facilities to enable sustainable management of waste."</p>
1248 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Contributions sought under this heading have a tenuous policy justification and once again appear to be supplementing the Council's budget in regard to its statutory responsibility. The requirement for waste facilities as set out in the Local Plan does not justify the collection of contributions to supplement the Council's statutory function as waste collector. This section should be removed from the SPD or at the very least subject to substantial amendment to ensure that facilities are provided within developments but do not replace the Council's normal statutory duty.	The provision of waste receptacles through planning obligations is established practice, directly mitigates the impact of new dwellings and is in conformity with circular 05/2005.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.6.7</i>				
1184 - Smith Stuart Reynolds (Mr Geoff Bolton) [443]	Object	Contributions for the provision of household waste and recycling receptacles are unjustified, as existing funding is available, and such contributions would serve to subsidise existing local authority expenditure - this is contrary to the advice in Circular 05/2005.	The provision of waste receptacles through planning obligations is established practice, directly mitigates the impact of new dwellings and is in conformity with circular 05/2005.	
1344 - Fairview New Homes Ltd [224]	Object	<p>It is acknowledged that Circular 05/2005 encourages the use of standard charges and formulae to give greater certainty to developers. However, in stating figures, the Council should only use indicative targets or examples and should not state required amounts. The use of obligations in this way could stifle smaller developments coming forward. Fairview therefore request that an additional paragraph should be added on each of the above listed topic that clearly states that these are possible guide levels of contribution only.</p> <p>Although Circular 05/2005 states that a planning obligation can be used to mitigate a development's impact, it has to relate to the site. Fairview request that it is made clear that contributions for the above listed uses should all be applied on a site-by-site basis.</p>	The provision of waste receptacles through planning obligations is established practice, directly mitigates the impact of new dwellings and is in conformity with circular 05/2005. The costs indicated in the SPD are calculated to reflect current expenditure by the Council. The City Council has a range of responsibilities in relation to waste, including waste minimisation, refuse collection, recycling and abandoned vehicles and street cleansing. The City Council will liaise with the County Council, the Waste Authority, as appropriate, in order to address the impact of development by providing appropriate facilities.	
1287 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	The two existing paras 3.6.7 should be consistent with the Recap Design Guide which is currently being prepared.	<p>Amend the paragraphs so they are in numerical order.</p> <p>Given changes in costs in the period since consultation ended on the draft SPD, the table will be amended to indicate that a charge of £25 will be levied per bin, resulting in a standard charge per household of £75 for three bins. In the event that recycling boxes are needed in the place of one of the standard bins, a charge of £5 will be levied per box.</p>	<p>Renumber the second paragraph 3.6.7 to 3.6.8.</p> <p>Amend the table to indicate that a charge of £25 will be levied per bin, resulting in a standard charge per household of £75 for three bins. In the event that recycling boxes are needed in the place of one of the standard bins, a charge of £5 will be levied per box.</p>
1249 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	<p>There are two paragraph 3.6.7s. The SPD needs to be revised to reflect this.</p> <p>A clear methodology for these contributions needs to be set out either in the SPD or appendix and its provenance shown to be robust. Without this justification, the figures are unreliable and do not meet the tests of Circular 05/05. The cost per flat of providing a Eurobin would appear to purchase significantly more bins than would be required for a development, and full justification for the figure of £150 is required.</p>	<p>Agree, amend the paragraphs so they are in numerical order.</p> <p>The provision of waste receptacles through planning obligations is established practice, directly mitigates the impact of new dwellings and is in conformity with circular 05/2005. The costs indicated in the SPD are calculated to reflect current expenditure by the Council.</p>	Renumber the second paragraph 3.6.7 to 3.6.8.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1410 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	This paragraph requires all residential developers to make a financial contribution towards the provision of waste and recycling receptacles for individual households. No background information has been provided in the SPD to explain or justify the scale of contribution being sought. The City Council have a statutory duty to provide waste collection services and appropriate receptacles for householders to use. No planning justification has been advanced to support this requirement.	The provision of waste receptacles through planning obligations is established practice, directly mitigates the impact of new dwellings and is in conformity with circular 05/2005. The costs indicated in the SPD are calculated to reflect current expenditure by the Council. The City Council has a range of responsibilities in relation to waste, including waste minimisation, refuse collection, recycling and abandoned vehicles and street cleansing. The City Council will liaise with the County Council, the Waste Authority, as appropriate, in order to address the impact of development by providing appropriate facilities.	
1614 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	If the Council is actually requiring the provision of the actual waste and recycling equipment itself or funding towards the operation of recycling schemes, the HBF firmly considers that these are more properly matters for the Waste Authority. Indeed the provision of actual recycling equipment is the responsibility of the Waste Authority who has the duty to provide it. Indeed the waste legislation means that no one else can be responsible for it. Again there appears to be no statutory planning policy justification for this approach.	The provision of waste receptacles through planning obligations is established practice, directly mitigates the impact of new dwellings and is in conformity with circular 05/2005. The costs indicated in the SPD are calculated to reflect current expenditure by the Council. The City Council has a range of responsibilities in relation to waste, including waste minimisation, refuse collection, recycling and abandoned vehicles and street cleansing. The City Council will liaise with the County Council, the Waste Authority, as appropriate, in order to address the impact of development by providing appropriate facilities.	
1156 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This requirement is consistent with Policy WM6 of the Proposed Changes.	Support noted.	
3.6.7				
1250 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	This paragraph does not take into consideration those larger development sites that are developed by a number of developers through separate applications and not one large application (and therefore one S106 agreement). This needs to be addressed in the SPD and it should be revised accordingly.	Concerns noted. However, this situation described is unusual. The Council has already stated the need to consider waste provision on a site-by-site basis for larger developments and would need to consider the delivery of these development sites in accordance with Policy 3/6 (Co-ordinated Development) of Cambridge Local Plan 2006.	
1200 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company (Miss Helen Moore) [452]	Object	Amend to read: "However, it is likely that developments comprising 1,000 or more residential units will be expected to incorporate new underground 7 unit mini recycling centres within the development site, subject to a site by site assessment and other development costs". Current wording is too prescriptive for larger sites, which must also be considered on a site by site basis.	Concerns noted. These sections provides a general explanation of the likely provision required for large-scale development, including the Areas of Major Change. The SPD will provide a starting point for negotiations, which will need to be undertaken on a site-by-site basis.	
1411 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	This paragraph refers to the need to provide "mini recycling centres" on residential development sites. Two thresholds are specified but it is not clear as to how they have been	These sections provides a general explanation of the likely provision required for large-scale development, including the Areas of Major Change. The SPD will provide a starting	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		determined. The requirements are worded in vague terms and no meaningful advice is given to applicants. Some cost information/site area requirements would be useful. At this stage no planning justification is apparent.	point for negotiations, which will need to be undertaken on a site-by-site basis.	
1615 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	If the Council is actually requiring the provision of the actual waste and recycling equipment itself or funding towards the operation of recycling schemes, the HBF firmly considers that these are more properly matters for the Waste Authority. Indeed the provision of actual recycling equipment is the responsibility of the Waste Authority who has the duty to provide it. Indeed the waste legislation means that no one else can be responsible for it. Again, there appears to be no statutory planning policy justification for this approach.	The provision of waste receptacles through planning obligations is established practice, directly mitigates the impact of new dwellings and is in conformity with circular 05/2005. The costs indicated in the SPD are calculated to reflect current expenditure by the Council. The City Council has a range of responsibilities in relation to waste, including waste minimisation, refuse collection, recycling and abandoned vehicles and street cleansing. The City Council will liaise with the County Council, the Waste Authority, as appropriate, in order to address the impact of development by providing appropriate facilities	
3.6.9				
1412 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	These paragraphs refer to the provision of larger facilities but no development threshold is given, nor is a reasoned explanation provided as to how the requirements might be fulfilled. Further clarification is therefore necessary in order to establish whether the requirement is justified.	These sections provides a general explanation of the likely provision required for large-scale development, including the Areas of Major Change. The SPD will provide a starting point for negotiations, which will need to be undertaken on a site-by-site basis.	
1285 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	Paragraph 3.6.9 should be clarified in greater detail.	Concerns noted. Whilst the City Council considers further detail on this issue should be provided by the County Council through their Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework documents, this section will be updated to reflect the deletion of Policy 7/12 and the majority of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003.	Update policy references in the light of deletion of Policy 7/12 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
3.6.10				
1413 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	These paragraphs refer to the provision of larger facilities but no development threshold is given, nor is a reasoned explanation provided as to how the requirements might be fulfilled. Further clarification is therefore necessary in order to establish whether the requirement is justified.	These sections provides a general explanation of the likely provision required for large-scale development, including the Areas of Major Change. The SPD will provide a starting point for negotiations, which will need to be undertaken on a site-by-site basis.	
1286 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	Para 3.6.10 appears to be out of place, and would make more sense following the first existing para 3.6.7 (there are 2 numbered 3.6.7).	Concerns noted. Paragraph 3.6.10 will be moved up to paragraph 3.6.8, with subsequent renumbering as required.	Move paragraph 3.6.10 to paragraph 3.6.8, with subsequent renumbering as required.
1314 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to this paragraph because it does not take account of the Code for Sustainable Homes. It should be amended to incorporate the principles of the Code	Concerns noted. However, the waste component of the Code for Sustainable Homes is not a mandatory element of the Code. As such, the Council would need to ensure the	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1616 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	If the Council is actually requiring the provision of the actual waste and recycling equipment itself or funding towards the operation of recycling schemes, the HBF firmly considers that these are more properly matters for the Waste Authority. Indeed the provision of actual recycling equipment is the responsibility of the Waste Authority who has the duty to provide it. Indeed the waste legislation means that no one else can be responsible for it. Again, there appears to be no statutory planning policy justification for this approach.	appropriate provision of waste receptacles in order to discharge its duty as the household waste and recycling collection authority. The provision of waste receptacles through planning obligations is established practice, directly mitigates the impact of new dwellings and is in conformity with circular 05/2005. The costs indicated in the SPD are calculated to reflect current expenditure by the Council. The City Council has a range of responsibilities in relation to waste, including waste minimisation, refuse collection, recycling and abandoned vehicles and street cleansing. The City Council will liaise with the County Council, the Waste Authority, as appropriate, in order to address the impact of development by providing appropriate facilities.	
3.7 Public Realm				
1460 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	We have explained on many occasions that requiring NHS providers (Primary, Secondary and Tertiary care) to contribute to planning obligations would reduce the cash available for healthcare and therefore have a direct impact on the health of the local population. In the section on SCATP contributions (para 3.2.14) the document makes specific reference to hospital and Health Service providers explaining that these organisations will be considered flexibly as special cases. The Trust requests that similar wording is inserted into sections of the document concerning Open Space, Waste, Public Realm and Public Art. This would be consistent with the endorsement of the decision of the Cambridgeshire Horizons Board in April 2005 in the following wording: "Primary Healthcare Schemes and NHS Hospital and Clinical Service developments should not be required to contribute to other community infrastructure funding, provided that the services to be made available will serve the essential needs of the population of the Cambridge sub-region".	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1642 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) Limited [243]	Object	In addition to the above, in our view there is also an overlap between the monies sought in respect of Section 3.7 Public Realm and Section 3.8 Public Art.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.7.1				
1252 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The definition of Public Realm should be amended as this is much more than 'hard surfaces'. Yes its not just the "hard surface areas" as it comprises all the spatial domain between buildings (i.e. Publicly owned streets, rights-of-ways, parks and other publicly accessible open spaces, and spaces around public and civic buildings and facilities). There needs to be clear distinction between public realm and informal recreation space (such as sitting out areas, passive recreation areas) or a recognition that such spaces can perform both functions. The SPD should be amended accordingly.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1414 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Most public realm is in the highway. Maintenance to the highway is undertaken by the local highway authority. There are funds existing to do this maintenance work. Are the improvement works described in addition to the normal upkeep of the highway infrastructure?	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1251 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The section on 'Public Realm' fails the test of circular 05/05. If a development does not demonstrate sufficient quality then it should be refused, in contrast if it does then a contribution need not be sought.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
3.7.3				
1193 - Impington Parish Council (Ms Vanessa Kelly) [448]	Object	The wording of the sentence beginning "It will therefore be reasonable to look to developers..." needs firming up. It would be all too easy for developers to argue against their having to make contributions towards community safety measures. If all the Areas of Major Change are developed, Cambridge will become a huge urban area with all that that means: increased crime, congestion, etc. Developers must offset that fully by proper levels of contributions.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
3.7.6				
1253 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Paragraph 3.7.6 and 3.7.7 essentially have the same purpose and are repetitive. One should be deleted to remove unnecessary repetition.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.7.7</i>				
1315 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to this paragraph which states that contributions should be made towards the following:* "Improvements to the public realm or community safety measures."The supporting paragraph to this should be amended to recognise that a proposed development may provide sufficient on-site private amenity space, which should be taken into account when considering any impact on the public realm.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
<i>3.7.9</i>				
1415 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Within new development lighting on adopted highway must be safe. This paragraph seems to imply that off-site new or improved lighting schemes could be required. Normally off-site provision would be on highway land. Highways should be maintained to a safe standard - the local highway authority has funding streams to do this. Does this mean that development should pay extra/over normal provision to reach a safe standard of lighting which the local highway authority is responsible for? Why should development pay for CCTV cameras? Does new development make streets less safe so that CCTV is required? Circular 05/2005 is clear that planning obligations should never be used to secure a 'betterment levy'. Planning obligations should not be used to secure contributions to achieve objectives that are not necessary to allow permission to be given for a particular development.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
<i>3.7.10</i>				
1617 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The SPD introduces public realm and community safety contribution requirements for developments of 20 or more dwellings. Again there appears to be no direct statutory policy justification to justify these specific new requirements. Nor do they seem to comply with the tests set out in Circular 5/05.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1416 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	No justification has been provided to support the imposition of the threshold and is different to other thresholds given in the strategy. Why has 20.00 hours been specified as a time for the application of the requirements?	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1173 - unex holdings limited (Mr stephen walsh) [445]	Object	The policy fails to recognise that these public realm contributions are duplicating payments required under the transportation contributions. If the council want to separate	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be	Delete Sub-section 3.7

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		out public realm contributions then it should not base transportation contributions on all-mode trips including pedestrians , cyclists and public transport.	determined on a site-by-site basis.	
1335 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	<p>There appears to us to be no justifiable reason for basing the calculation of any contribution by reference to proposed floorspace.</p> <p>Public realm contributions are justified in the strategy as a consequence of additional visitors, customers or employees putting pressure on the urban spaces within the City. Any contribution should therefore be directly related to the additional trips arising from the development, irrespective of the floorspace created.</p> <p>Reference to the method of calculation using sq.m. should be deleted and replaced by reference to a contribution linked to additional trips over and above an agreed threshold.</p>	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1316 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to the Council's trigger level that developments comprising 20 units of more are likely to require a contribution to public realm / community safety.This threshold should be deleted.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1254 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The definition of residential development to which public realm and community safety contributions apply are not clear in terms of whether these also apply to student housing, care or residential homes or 100% affordable housing schemes. This needs to be clarified in the document. In addition, for non-residential uses, the SPD clearly defines how contributions are required in relation to specific use classes however this does not address sui generis uses or developments providing a mix of these uses. This needs to be clarified in the SPD and this paragraph should be amended accordingly.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1157 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This is consistent with Policy CSR1 of the Proposed Changes in that it will contribute towards the protection and enhancement of the City. It is also consistent with Policy ENV7 that states new development should address crime prevention and community safety.	Support noted. However, Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.7.8				
1255 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Providing on-site public realm improvements and then 'topping up' the contribution to the equivalent off-site contribution takes no account of the quality of the public realm provided, nor does it allow for public realm works to take place that are reasonably related to the development if additional payment is always required.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1185 - Smith Stuart Reynolds (Mr Geoff Bolton) [443]	Object	It will be extremely difficult to apply this approach in a fair and consistent manner, given the difficulty in establishing robust criteria as to what on site provision qualifies as a public realm improvement and what its financial value is; this approach is therefore likely to be unworkable in practice.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
3.7.10				
1256 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	This is the second 3.7.10 of the document and should be amended accordingly. If contributions are to be used to centrally pooled schemes, these schemes need to be identified in a published document to provide certainty to developers and to ensure that money for public realm works is not used to fund developments that would normally be the responsibility of the City or County Council.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1417 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Provision should be made for developers to be consulted over where the contribution is to be spent. A time-scale (five years) should be specified for the use of the funds with provision for them to be returned to the developer if they not used.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1473 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Support	The Trust notes that in paragraph 3.7.10 on page 45 that the Council might consider the allocation of Public Realm contribution areas other than the immediate development proposal and be used for the benefit of citywide users. The Trust would welcome the opportunity to discuss possible opportunities for contributions to be allocated for public realm improvements on the Addenbrooke's site which would benefit many of the residents of the City who attend the campus for hospital treatments.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.7.11</i>				
1194 - Impington Parish Council (Ms Vanessa Kelly) [448]	Object	3.7.11 really does seem like the ultimate get-out clause developers will use to reduce or avoid completely payment of contributions. Of course there will be community safety measures on and off every site.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
<i>3.7.12</i>				
1418 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	No explanation has been given to support the imposition of the suggested financial contributions.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1186 - Smith Stuart Reynolds (Mr Geoff Bolton) [443]	Object	There is no justification for the proposed rates for contributions. Any public realm contribution rate needs to be based on a costed strategy (as referred to in 3.7.13) which should be prepared first, and there needs to be a direct relationship between an approved project and the development in question, otherwise a contribution is inappropriate.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1345 - Fairview New Homes Ltd [224]	Object	It is acknowledged that Circular 05/2005 encourages the use of standard charges and formulae to give greater certainty to developers. However, in stating figures, the Council should only use indicative targets or examples and should not state required amounts. The use of obligations in this way could stifle smaller developments coming forward. Fairview therefore request that an additional paragraph should be added on each of the above listed topic that clearly states that these are possible guide levels of contribution only. Although Circular 05/2005 states that a planning obligation can be used to mitigate a development's impact, it has to relate to the site. Fairview request that it is made clear that contributions for the above listed uses should all be applied on a site-by-site basis.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1174 - unex holdings limited (Mr stephen walsh) [445]	Object	The proposed contributions are far too high.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1257 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	How are the Council justifying £2000 per unit for public realm contributions and £4000 per 100m2 for non-residential developments? Both figures are excessive and place considerable burden on development schemes. This contribution should depend on the size of unit and the	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		number of occupants which will determine the impact of a scheme. This amount should be negotiated on a site-by-site basis where by the contribution can be assessed in terms of the development having regard to circular 05/2005. The same comments apply to the contributions in relation to community safety.		
1618 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The SPD introduces public realm and community safety contribution requirements of £4,000 for developments of 20 or more dwellings. Again there appears to be no direct statutory policy justification to justify these specific new requirements. Nor do they seem to comply with the tests set out in Circular 5/05. Nor is there any evidence base to justify them. Nor do they take account of actual provision/deficiencies. They seem to purely be a way of getting the private sector to pay for public sector general improvements.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1317 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to the Council's level of financial contributions as set out in paragraph 3.7.12. These should be amended to include a justification for the level of contribution being sought.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
1195 - Impington Parish Council (Ms Vanessa Kelly) [448]	Object	These financial contribution figures are much too low - the problems associated with large urban areas will become all too apparent as Cambridge grows. Proper funding needs to be in place to tackle them.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
3.7.13				
1258 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The Council's public realm strategy needs to be provided at the same time as this POS SPD. Without it, there are several gaps in policy, specifically where off-site contributions would be spent. This needs to be provided as a matter of priority to give developers greater certainty in relation to public realm contributions.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7
3.7.14				
1187 - Smith Stuart Reynolds (Mr Geoff Bolton) [443]	Object	Community safety measures requirements should be identified on a site by site basis and only where needed to offset adverse impacts and to make the development acceptable in planning and safety terms; they should not subject to a standard formula charge. Also an expenditure period needs to be specified.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.7 - Public Realm has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as it is considered that public realm contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.7

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.8 Public Art</i>				
1461 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	<p>We have explained on many occasions that requiring NHS providers (Primary, Secondary and Tertiary care) to contribute to planning obligations would reduce the cash available for healthcare and therefore have a direct impact on the health of the local population.</p> <p>In the section on SCATP contributions (para 3.2.14) the document makes specific reference to hospital and Health Service providers explaining that these organisations will be considered flexibly as special cases. The Trust requests that similar wording is inserted into sections of the document concerning Open Space, Waste, Public Realm and Public Art. This would be consistent with the endorsement of the decision of the Cambridgeshire Horizons Board in April 2005 in the following wording:</p> <p>"Primary Healthcare Schemes and NHS Hospital and Clinical Service developments should not be required to contribute to other community infrastructure funding, provided that the services to be made available will serve the essential needs of the population of the Cambridge sub-region".</p>	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as the Council's Public Art SPD was adopted in January 2010.	Delete Sub-section 3.8
1643 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) Limited [243]	Object	In addition to the above, in our view there is also an overlap between the monies sought in respect of Section 3.7 Public Realm and Section 3.8 Public Art.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, as the Council's Public Art SPD was adopted in January 2010.	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.8.1 1259 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Seeking a contribution for public art on the basis of development value should not be used to indicate how good the public art provided it. It is not a demonstration of quality and such an approach fundamentally corrupts the foundations of artistic freedom.	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide S106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on a developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the S106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for public art, on any site.</p> <p>The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should accompany the planning application or preferably form part of pre-application negotiations.</p> <p>Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence. but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.8.3 1350 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd (Miss Joanne Clark) [326]	Object	The requirement for the equivalent value of 1% of the total capital construction costs of the development to be applied to all Major applications is totally unreasonable and out of scale with other contributions. A significant amount of flexibility is required taking into account the wider S106 package and relative priorities, many of which are more directly related to the impact of these major developments. Furthermore it should be recognised that a greater contribution does not necessarily result in better quality public art. With careful consideration for context very high quality public art can be achieved at reasonable cost.	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide S106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on a developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the S106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for public art, on any site.</p> <p>The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should accompany the planning application or preferably form part of pre-application negotiations.</p> <p>Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence. but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8
1463 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	You and Roger Cutting have been discussing processes to consider contributions to Public Art. As part of this arrangement, discussions have focused on a more flexible approach to the Percent for Art requirement by which revenue schemes and performances of music and poetry etc are also considered as an art contribution rather than only taking into account a one off capital payment.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1336 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	<p>The University already makes a significant contribution to public art within the City and can point to many University Museum's and Galleries, including the Fitzwilliam Museum and Kettles Yard that are open to the public and free of charge. This is a major contribution to public art within the City.</p> <p>Similarly, the high capital investment in architecture and landscaping made by the University in new building projects, many of which are used by the public, adds significantly to the appearance and quality of the public realm.</p> <p>The University has never believed that this obligation meets the tests set out in Circular 05/2005 or that public art is necessary to make a proposed development acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>The requirement for contributions to public art should be deleted from the strategy or, at least, credit be given to the University for the investment it already makes in terms of public art throughout the City as its contribution to public art in respect of building projects.</p>	<p>followed.</p> <p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8
1619 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>The Council seek to require a contribution for art provision of 1% of the total capital costs. Again there is no actual justification for an actual requirement within either the Adopted Plan or Circular 5/05. Whilst art provision contributions can be encouraged, they cannot be dictated for every residential scheme.</p> <p>The wording of policies which involve the incorporation/contribution of art into potential developments are often excessive, inflexible and go beyond the remit of Town and Country Planning. As such it is clear that the provision of, or contribution towards public art cannot be considered a proper function of planning control, as was recognised by the leading counsel when addressing the Arts Council and recognised in the Arts Council Steering Group report.</p> <p>Therefore policies must make it clear that the Council will seek to negotiate with developers for the provision of, or contributions towards public art, where appropriate, rather than requiring it in all circumstances.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide Section 106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on the developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the Section 106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for any site.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development, including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should be part of the pre-application negotiations and subsequently accompany the planning application.</p> <p>Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence, but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public.</p>	
1419 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Further justification is required as to why on-site provision is required in preference to provision off-site. No indication has been given as to why a contribution equivalent to 1% of the construction costs is being pursued.	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide S106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on a developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the S106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for public art, on any site.</p> <p>The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should accompany the planning application or preferably form part of pre-application negotiations.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1158 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This is consistent with Policies SS1 and SS2 of the Proposed Changes document that requires new development to contribute to improving quality of life.	Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence. but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public. Support noted. However, Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.8.4 1620 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>The Council seek to require a contribution for art provision of 1% of the total capital costs. Again there is no actual justification for an actual requirement within either the Adopted Plan or Circular 5/05. Whilst art provision contributions can be encouraged, they cannot be dictated for every residential scheme.</p> <p>The wording of policies which involve the incorporation/contribution of art into potential developments are often excessive, inflexible and go beyond the remit of Town and Country Planning. As such it is clear that the provision of, or contribution towards public art cannot be considered a proper function of planning control, as was recognised by the leading counsel when addressing the Arts Council and recognised in the Arts Council Steering Group report.</p> <p>Therefore policies must make it clear that the Council will seek to negotiate with developers for the provision of, or contributions towards public art, where appropriate, rather than requiring it in all circumstances.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide Section 106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on the developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the Section 106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for any site.</p> <p>The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development, including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should be part of the pre-application negotiations and subsequently accompany the planning application.</p> <p>Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence, but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8
1318 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to the Council's trigger level that developments with a 1% capital construction cost would be less than £15,000 will normally require a financial contribution to be made towards the provision of off-site public art. This threshold should be deleted.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>followed.</p> <p>The threshold set out in the Council's Public Art SPD is £25,000 as experience suggests that a lower sum may cause it to be difficult to commission and deliver a high quality artwork, which will mitigate the impact of the new development, as well as provide an appropriate sum for its maintenance.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide Section 106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on the developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the Section 106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for any site.</p> <p>The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development, including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should be part of the pre-application negotiations and subsequently accompany the planning application.</p> <p>Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence, but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public.</p>	
1420 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Further justification is required as to why a threshold of £15,000 has been set for off-site contributions. Public art need not necessarily require an artist to be commissioned. It could form part of the architectural detailing e.g. railings, gates, ground treatment and community art (it should be noted that this list is not exhaustive). The paragraph suggests a specific installation or event by an 'artist' but does not define what is meant by an artist. A contribution to public art can be made in a variety of ways.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1159 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	This is consistent with Policies SS1 and SS2 of the Proposed Changes document that requires new development to contribute to improving quality of life.	<p>The threshold set out in the Council's Public Art SPD is £25,000 as experience suggests that a lower sum may cause it to be difficult to commission and deliver a high quality artwork, which will mitigate the impact of the new development, as well as provide an appropriate sum for its maintenance.</p> <p>Support noted. However, Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.8.5 1621 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>The Council seek to require a contribution for art provision of 1% of the total capital costs. Again there is no actual justification for an actual requirement within either the Adopted Plan or Circular 5/05. Whilst art provision contributions can be encouraged, they cannot be dictated for every residential scheme.</p> <p>The wording of policies which involve the incorporation/contribution of art into potential developments are often excessive, inflexible and go beyond the remit of Town and Country Planning. As such it is clear that the provision of, or contribution towards public art cannot be considered a proper function of planning control, as was recognised by the leading counsel when addressing the Arts Council and recognised in the Arts Council Steering Group report.</p> <p>Therefore policies must make it clear that the Council will seek to negotiate with developers for the provision of, or contributions towards public art, where appropriate, rather than requiring it in all circumstances.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide S106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on the developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the S106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for any site.</p> <p>The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development, including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should be part of the pre-application negotiations and subsequently accompany the planning application.</p> <p>Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence, but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.8.6 1346 - Fairview New Homes Ltd [224]	Object	<p>It is acknowledged that Circular 05/2005 encourages the use of standard charges and formulae to give greater certainty to developers. However, in stating figures, the Council should only use indicative targets or examples and should not state required amounts. The use of obligations in this way could stifle smaller developments coming forward. Fairview therefore request that an additional paragraph should be added on each of the above listed topic that clearly states that these are possible guide levels of contribution only.</p> <p>Although Circular 05/2005 states that a planning obligation can be used to mitigate a development's impact, it has to relate to the site. Fairview request that it is made clear that contributions for the above listed uses should all be applied on a site-by-site basis.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide Section 106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on the developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the Section 106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for any site.</p> <p>The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development, including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should be part of the pre-application negotiations and subsequently accompany the planning application.</p> <p>Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence, but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8
1622 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The Council seek to require a contribution for art provision of 1% of the total capital costs. Again there is no actual justification for an actual requirement within either the Adopted Plan or Circular 5/05. Whilst art provision contributions can be encouraged, they cannot be dictated for every residential scheme.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>The wording of policies which involve the incorporation/contribution of art into potential developments are often excessive, inflexible and go beyond the remit of Town and Country Planning. As such it is clear that the provision of, or contribution towards public art cannot be considered a proper function of planning control, as was recognised by the leading counsel when addressing the Arts Council and recognised in the Arts Council Steering Group report.</p> <p>Therefore policies must make it clear that the Council will seek to negotiate with developers for the provision of, or contributions towards public art, where appropriate, rather than requiring it in all circumstances.</p>	<p>followed.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide Section 106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on the developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the Section 106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for any site.</p> <p>The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development, including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should be part of the pre-application negotiations and subsequently accompany the planning application.</p> <p>Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence, but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.8.7				
1319 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to this paragraph which states:"...However, some expenditure will be on projects within the central part of the city which will benefit all city users so in these instances, expenditure will be on a citywide basis."	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>The policy requirement is applied to specific developments to provide compensation or mitigation and in most cases there will be a functional and/or geographic link between the development and the public art. For this reason, the majority of public art will be provided on-site and the test is met fully. However, for reasons spelt out in the Public Art SPD there may be circumstances where this cannot be achieved and off site provision is preferred and resources are pooled to make a more effective contribution. There is also a justification for this in that development cumulatively has citywide impacts that a wider application of public art can help to mitigate. In Cambridge off-site provision, e.g. for open space and community facilities, is an established procedure. Paragraph 9.2 of the draft SPD says that off-site provision will wherever possible be in reasonable proximity to the contributing developments. Paragraph B14 of the circular endorses the principle of off-site provision where the circumstances are specified.</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8
1623 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>The Council seek to require a contribution for art provision of 1% of the total capital costs. Again there is no actual justification for an actual requirement within either the Adopted Plan or Circular 5/05. Whilst art provision contributions can be encouraged, they cannot be dictated for every residential scheme.</p> <p>The wording of policies which involve the incorporation/contribution of art into potential developments are often excessive, inflexible and go beyond the remit of Town and Country Planning. As such it is clear that the provision of, or contribution towards public art cannot be considered a proper function of planning control, as was recognised by the leading counsel when addressing the Arts Council and recognised in the Arts Council Steering Group report.</p> <p>Therefore policies must make it clear that the Council will</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide Section 106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on the developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the Section 106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		seek to negotiate with developers for the provision of, or contributions towards public art, where appropriate, rather than requiring it in all circumstances.	<p>development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for any site.</p> <p>The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development, including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should be part of the pre-application negotiations and subsequently accompany the planning application.</p> <p>Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence, but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public.</p>	
3.8.8				
1188 - Smith Stuart Reynolds (Mr Geoff Bolton) [443]	Object	An expenditure period needs to be specified and this should not exceed 10 years.	Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed. The expenditure period will be stipulated on a case by case basis.	Delete Sub-section 3.8
1624 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>The Council seek to require a contribution for art provision of 1% of the total capital costs. Again there is no actual justification for an actual requirement within either the Adopted Plan or Circular 5/05. Whilst art provision contributions can be encouraged, they cannot be dictated for every residential scheme.</p> <p>The wording of policies which involve the incorporation/contribution of art into potential developments are often excessive, inflexible and go beyond the remit of Town and Country Planning. As such it is clear that the provision of, or contribution towards public art cannot be considered a proper function of planning control, as was recognised by the leading counsel when addressing the</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide Section 106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on the</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Arts Council and recognised in the Arts Council Steering Group report.</p> <p>Therefore policies must make it clear that the Council will seek to negotiate with developers for the provision of, or contributions towards public art, where appropriate, rather than requiring it in all circumstances.</p>	<p>developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the Section 106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for any site.</p> <p>The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development, including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should be part of the pre-application negotiations and subsequently accompany the planning application.</p> <p>Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence, but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public.</p>	
1320 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	<p>We object to this paragraph which states:"...However, some expenditure will be on projects within the central part of the city which will benefit all city users so in these instances, expenditure will be on a citywide basis."</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Sub-section 3.8 - Public Art has been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the Council has produced a separate Public Art SPD (adopted January 2010). All parties have been given the opportunity to comment on matters related to public art and all procedures (PPS12 and regulations contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) have been followed.</p> <p>The policy requirement is applied to specific developments to provide compensation or mitigation and in most cases there will be a functional and/or geographic link between the development and the public art. For this reason, the majority of public art will be provided on-site and the test is met fully. However, for reasons spelt out in the Public Art SPD there may be circumstances where this cannot be achieved and off site provision is preferred and resources are pooled to make a more effective contribution. There is also a justification for this in that development cumulatively has citywide impacts that a wider application of public art can help to mitigate. In Cambridge off-site provision, e.g. for open space and community facilities, is an established procedure. Paragraph 9.2 of the draft SPD says that off-site</p>	Delete Sub-section 3.8

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>provision will wherever possible be in reasonable proximity to the contributing developments. Paragraph B14 of the circular endorses the principle of off-site provision where the circumstances are specified.</p>				
<p>3.9 Other Potential Development-Specific Planning Obligation Requirements</p>				
1513 - Environment Agency (Mr Adam Ireland) [214]	Object	We would advise the need to take a more strategic look at SuDS. We would prefer to avoid the creation of any ad-hoc or piecemeal systems (as inferred by 3.9) to surface water drainage wherever possible (e.g. strategic/combined approach taken for Newmarket Road, Cambridge Airport and Cherry Hinton).	<p>Concern noted. Given that further detailed guidance on SuDS, including long term maintenance, is contained within the adopted Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, reference to them in this Strategy is now to be removed. The Planning Obligations Strategy will make clear in section 1 that developers need to refer to other adopted SPDs when considering the planning obligations that may be required.</p> <p>In addition, the City Council has recently adopted the Cambridge Sustainable Drainage Design and Adoption Guide (2009). This document sets out the design and adoption requirements that the City Council will seek for SuDS within the public open space of new developments, which will be adopted by the City Council. This document is also intended to act as design guidance to assist developers when designing SuDS systems irrespective of who the adoption body will be.</p>	Identify in section 1 that developers need to refer to other adopted SPDs when considering the planning obligations that may be required.
1475 - English Heritage (East of England Region) (Katharine Fletcher) [234]	Object	We note that the potential for impact on the historic core of Cambridge is considered in these documents and that provision is made for contributions to improve the public realm in the city. It might also be appropriate to consider, in section 3.9, the need for contributions to the conservation and repair of historic buildings on larger sites, and to archaeological evaluation and mitigation. While the SPD will not provide an exhaustive list of areas for contributions these are reasonably common example.	Concern noted. A further bullet point will be added to reflect potential impacts on the historic environment.	Add a further bullet point to paragraph 3.9.1 as follows: "Impacts on the historic environment (4/9, 4/10, 4/11, 4/12)".
1495 - Cambridge Older People's Enterprise (Mr Robert Boorman) [477]	Object	Some capital funding could be directed to a Dial a Ride or similar schemes for transport for the disabled, elderly and infirm.	<p>Concern noted. However, in line with national policy related to planning obligations as set out in Circular 05/2005, obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following five tests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) relevant to planning; 2) Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms; 3) directly related to the proposed development; 4) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and 5) Reasonable in all other respects. 	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1421 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	While it is accepted that there may be a need for some development-specific requirements, it is questionable whether a separate section is required since it does not provide any further detail. Would it not be more appropriate to incorporate a suitable paragraph within the opening section to Chapter 3?	While recognising the importance of Dial a Ride Schemes, it is unlikely that requiring developers to contribute to such schemes would meet the requirements of the Circular. Concern noted. However, it is considered that by listing these other potential development specific requirements in a separate section provides more certainty to developers of how they may be required to mitigate the impacts of development.	
3.9.1				
1216 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178] 1268 - Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mrs Amie Lill) [1088]	Support	Welcome the inclusion of the various Mitigation Measures and also the inclusion of sums to support long-term the maintenance of sustainable Urban Drainage Suystems and their maintenance. Land drainage considerations can be very important in providing capacity for wastewater facilities	Support noted. Given that further detailed guidance on SuDS, including long term maintenance, is contained within the adopted Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, reference to them in this Strategy is now to be removed. The Planning Obligations Strategy will make clear in section 1 that developers need to refer to other adopted SPDs when considering the planning obligations that may be required. In addition, the City Council has recently adopted the Cambridge Sustainable Drainage Design and Adoption Guide (2009). This document sets out the design and adoption requirements that the City Council will seek for SuDS within the public open space of new developments, which will be adopted by the City Council. This document is also intended to act as design guidance to assist developers when designing SuDS systems irrespective of who the adoption body will be.	Identify in section 1 that developers need to refer to other adopted SPDs when considering the planning obligations that may be required.
3.9.2				
1260 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The idea that financial contributions are the only way that the loss or damage of a specific feature can be replaced needs to be addressed. It is possible for a developer to provide an alternative in such situations, either on or off-site. This needs to be reflected in the SPD. Such alternatives can be provided and monitored for provision through the proposed monitoring of the S106.	Paragraph 3.9.2 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD recognises that in some cases specific mitigation measures will be required to be carried out by the developer, while in others it may be more appropriate for financial contributions to be sought. It does not state that financial contributions are the only way that the loss or damage of a specific feature can be replaced. The exact method by which such loss or damage will be addressed will be negotiated on a case by case basis, taking account of the scale and nature of the development and the extent of the impact in each case.	

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****Council's Assessment****Action****4. Planning Obligations Strategy/Requirements for the Areas of Major Change****4.3**

1422 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	This section simply needs to identify the Areas of Major Change and state that detailed guidance will be produced on a site by site basis having regard to the requirements of the overall planning obligations strategy if that is the intention. At present this section does not add anything significant or serve any real useful purpose.	Concerns noted. A new paragraph has been added to the beginning of this section to clarify the purpose: "This section provides a general explanation about the Areas of Major Change and sets out how detailed guidance for these areas has or will be provided in Area Action Plans or other documents. However, where area based guidance has yet to be produced, this SPD will be used as a starting point for negotiations. It is important that there is an overarching planning obligations framework in place that sets out some of the key principles that will inform the negotiations on these proposed developments."	Insert a new paragraph at the beginning of Section 4 to read: "This section provides a general explanation about the Areas of Major Change and sets out how detailed guidance for these areas has or will be provided in Area Action Plans or other documents. However, where area based guidance has yet to be produced, this SPD will be used as a starting point for negotiations. It is important that there is an overarching planning obligations framework in place that sets out some of the key principles that will inform the negotiations on these proposed developments."
1288 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	In paragraph 4.3, reference should be to the Cambridge North West Transport Study (not Strategy).	Concerns noted. The list of documents in this section has been updated. This study is no longer referred to, following the adoption of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan in October 2009.	Delete references to North West Cambridge Transport Strategy and North West Cambridge Green Belt Landscape Study and insert reference to North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (Adopted October 2009).

4.4

1337 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	The University accepts that more detailed assessment will be needed of the infrastructure requirements for each area of major change and welcomes the involvement of all appropriate stakeholders in assessing those needs. The revised planning obligation strategy should set the context and framework for any planning obligations. Site owners and or developers should be involved in any discussions and the Strategy should make specific reference to their involvement.	Concerns noted. The Council is keen to engage with stakeholders as part of further detailed assessments of infrastructure requirements and will involve stakeholders as appropriate.	
1167 - East of England Regional Assembly (Mr Stewart Patience) [431]	Support	Policy H2 of the Proposed Changes requires development to be coordinated with necessary transport and other infrastructure provision. Operation of that approach on	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		specific sites within Cambridge is for local determination		
4.6				
1626 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	If the Council is actually requiring the provision of the actual waste and recycling equipment itself, or funding towards the operation of recycling schemes, the HBF firmly considers that these are more properly matters for the Waste Authority. Indeed, the provision of actual recycling equipment is the responsibility of the Waste Authority who has a duty to provide it. Indeed the waste legislation means that no one else can be responsible for it. Again, there appears to be no statutory planning policy justification for this approach.	Concerns noted. However, the City Council does have a range of responsibilities in relation to waste, including waste minimisation, refuse collection, recycling and abandoned vehicles and street cleansing. The City Council will liaise with the County Council, the Waste Authority, as appropriate, in order to address the impact of development by providing appropriate facilities.	
1653 - Natural England (Mr Justin Tilley) [496]	Object	Natural England welcomes the inclusion of Countryside Access and Rights of Way provision along the Open Space provision in the list of new on-site infrastructure provision to be sought. We strongly recommend that provision for biodiversity enhancement is included in this list, in relation to the aims of the Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy.	Concerns noted. However, this list is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather illustrative.	
1201 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company (Miss Helen Moore) [452]	Object	Amend to read: "Such new on -site infrastructure provision is likely to include all or some of the following, depending on the individual development and will be considered on a site by site basis".	Concerns noted. It is considered that the proposed addition to the sentence is unnecessary as the sentence already makes reference to "depending on the individual development."	
1625 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	Some of the items listed for which financial contributions might be sought seem to lack any specific statutory planning policy justification. They also seem to fail the tests as set out in Circular 5/05. Whilst it may be appropriate to seek the provision of facilities that provide for community services it is neither the role nor the responsibility of developers to pay for actual public 'services provision' as specified.	Concerns noted. However, this list is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather illustrative. Whilst it sets out examples of the type of infrastructure that would be envisioned in the Areas of Major Change, developments would be subject to detailed assessment and any contributions sought would be in accordance with Circular 05/2005.	
1289 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	The inclusion of waste management in para 4.6 is welcomed. Reference should also be made to the requirement for 'temporary waste management facilities'. Also in paragraph 4.6, the County Council request that 'Offsite transport measures' be added to the list.	Concerns noted. However, it is considered that this level of detail is unnecessary, with detailed discussions likely to take place via negotiations on individual sites.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4.8				
1202 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company (Miss Helen Moore) [452]	Object	Add to end: "Where possible and appropriate the dual use and co-location of facilities will be considered to make the most efficient use of land and resources".	Concerns noted. A new sentence will be inserted at the end of paragraph 4.8 to read "In some instances, there may be opportunities for dual use and co-location of facilities."	Insert new sentence at the end of paragraph 4.8 to read "In some instances, there may be opportunities for dual use and co-location of facilities."
1469 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	There are various other references in the draft document to the need to include the PCT in general planning application consultation processes; these would need to include consultations with our Trust. This would include extending the Council's commitment to work other external organisations as set out in paragraph 4.1 of Appendix A to include working with our Trust. The Trust could also helpfully be included in the list of stakeholders set out in paragraph 4.8. This would help the Council fulfil its obligations to maintain and improve the health of the local population.	Concerns noted. The "Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust" will be included in the list of stakeholders in paragraph 4.8.	Insert "Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust" in the list of stakeholders in paragraph 4.8.
4.10				
1515 - Environment Agency (Mr Adam Ireland) [214]	Support	As it could prove to be a dangerous or unsustainable to consider requirements of a single development in isolation from others, we are therefore pleased to see the inclusion of paragraph 4.10. Examples of formulae being derived for a strategic area that developers are obliged to commit include Fengate in Peterborough and currently for Corby, Northants.	Support noted.	
4.11				
1627 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The reference to at least 5 years maintenance should be deleted as it is considered contrary to national policy and has no apparent local statutory policy justification. Indeed, the Council itself refers in paragraph 2.5 of the text to the Circular's comments on maintenance payments. The reference to at least 5 years maintenance should therefore be deleted as it is contrary to national policy and it also has no apparent local statutory policy justification.	Concerns noted. However, paragraph 4.11 does not contain a reference to a '5 year maintenance period', instead it states that "...some facilities will be required for the first few years (with the specific period sought depending on the nature of the infrastructure to be provided)." This is in accordance with the requirements of Circular 05/2005, which allows for pump priming for a limited period of time.	
1351 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd (Miss Joanne Clark) [326]	Object	It is acknowledged that Circular 05/05 envisages some pump-priming being necessary in certain circumstances however para 4.11 of the revised strategy is very vague and open to over-application. Any requirement for pump-priming will need to be justified in detail and careful consideration of opening dates of facilities is required; for	Concerns noted. This is an important matter, which will need to be the subject of detailed negotiations on a site by site basis.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		example a community centre should not be provided in the very early stages of a development if there are insufficient residents to use it. The developer's build programme and related cash-flow are very important considerations		

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

5. Monitoring and Review of Planning Obligations and Expenditure of Contributions

5.1

1338 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	<p>The University supports the use of dedicated resources to ensure that the implementation of agreements is properly monitored by the City Council to ensure that all signatories meet their obligations. There should be a clear audit trail between the contributions made and the infrastructure provided and details should be made publicly available.</p> <p>There should be a stricter timescale for the delivery of the infrastructure for which planning obligation money is collected by the public authorities. The basis for the planning obligation is that the contribution was necessary to provide the infrastructure to mitigate the impact of development when planning permission was granted.</p> <p>If a developer contribution was felt necessary towards this infrastructure when planning permission was granted, then it is incumbent on the relevant local authority to use that money to provide facilities for which the contribution was made within an agreed timescale to be set out in the S 106 agreement or for that money to be repaid if not spent within the timescale set out.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. This issue is specifically referenced in paragraph B24 of Circular 05/2005. . The timing of a rebate to a developer would depend on the precise wording of a legal agreement, which would be monitored by the Council and the developer.</p>	
1647 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) Limited [243]	Object	<p>We would highlight that Circular 05/05 states at paragraph B24 that where contributions are made toward specific infrastructure provision, but that infrastructure is not provided within an agreed timescale, that arrangements should be made to return the monies to the developer.</p> <p>It is noted that the SPD refers to a 10 year period for the spending of monies, however there is no reference to the monies being remitted back to the developer at the expiration of this period. In the first instance 10 years is too long a period, rather the spending period should be agreed on a site-by-site basis having regard to the nature of the mitigation required. Moreover, the SPD should expressly refer to the monies being returned to the developer if unspent. These provisions are crucial in terms of ensuring that infrastructure is provided on a timely basis to mitigate the actual impacts of a development.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. However, this issue is specifically referenced in paragraph B24 of Circular 05/2005. As such, it is considered that this level of detail should not be included in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. The timing of a rebate would depend on the precise wording of a legal agreement, which would be monitored by the Council and the developer.</p> <p>The reference in paragraph 5.1 to a 10 year period only refers to the ongoing growth of the city and does not set out specific timescales for contributions on specific developments.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5.2				
1321 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to this paragraph because it does not permit a rebate of the charges if it is not used within the agreed timeframe of the agreement.	Concerns noted. However, this issue is specifically referenced in paragraph B24 of Circular 05/2005. As such, it is considered that this level of detail should not be included in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. The timing of a rebate would depend on the precise wording of a legal agreement, which would be monitored by the Council and the developer.	
1423 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	While it is accepted that the monitoring of any Section 106 is necessary, the cost for monitoring should not be either wholly or principally met by the applicant. A reference to this effect is not contained within Circular 05/2005 and as such there is no reasonable justification for this. If such an approach is to be followed what are the total estimated costs for monitoring as opposed to what is being sought and how have they been calculated? Do Cambridgeshire Horizons have a role in securing funding for this element given their delivery remit?	Concerns noted. However, Circular 05/2005 does not prohibit administrative charges being levied. The good practice guidelines on planning obligations advise local authorities to ensure that sufficient resources are in place to deal with planning obligations.	
1628 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The HBF considers that Planning Obligations form part of the planning process for which the Local Authority has a legal duty to perform in the determination of planning applications. Applicants have to pay a fee for the submission of their planning application, which is used to help fund the planning service in question. The HBF does not believe that it is appropriate to seek the submission of separate fees for different services that still fall under its remit as the Local Planning Authority.	Concerns noted. However, Circular 05/2005 does not prohibit administrative charges being levied. The good practice guidelines on planning obligations advise local authorities to ensure that sufficient resources are in place to deal with planning obligations.	
5.3				
1146 - Emma Wilson (Miss Emma Wilson) [422]	Object	Circular 5/05 does not appear to suggest that developers should pay a financial contribution towards the monitoring of S106 agreements. It would, therefore, seem inappropriate to implement this.	Concerns noted. However Circular 05/2005 does not prohibit administrative charges being levied. The good practice guidelines on planning obligations advise local authorities to ensure that sufficient resources are in place to deal with planning obligations.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5.4				
1629 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205] 1648 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) Limited [243] 1339 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364] 1175 - unex holdings limited (Mr stephen walsh) [445]	Object	The paragraph states that the Council will charge per clause for the monitoring of planning obligations. Circular 05/05 makes no provision for monitoring charges. It is our position that it is not for the applicant to pay for the Council to undertake their statutory duty. This provision is already addressed through either the planning application fee or it forms part of the Council DCLG grant. It is not therefore appropriate for the Council to double charge. Reference to a monitoring fee should therefore be deleted.	Concerns noted. However Circular 05/2005 does not prohibit administrative charges being levied. The good practice guidelines on planning obligations advise local authorities to ensure that sufficient resources are in place to deal with planning obligations.	
5.5				
1189 - Smith Stuart Reynolds (Mr Geoff Bolton) [443]	Object	The proposed formula charge is not explained in terms of the quantum of income that the City Council is seeking to achieve. Further guidance is required in relation to the charges for developemnts in Areas of Major Change. Any charges should exclude costs incurred in monitoring planning conditions as this is (or should be) part of normal enforcement work.	Concerns noted. However, Circular 05/2005 does not prohibit administrative charges being levied. The good practice guidelines on planning obligations advise local authorities to ensure that sufficient resources are in place to deal with planning obligations. As the large-scale development in the Areas of Major Change are varied in nature and are complex, it is considered inappropriate to add additional detail to the SPD. Each scheme needs to be considered on a development-specific basis.	
1322 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to this paragraph because the Council does not demonstrate what output will be generated from the monitoring charge.	Concerns noted. However, paragraph 5.2 details the administrative/monitoring tasks to be resourced via the charges levied for monitoring different planning obligations clauses.	
1261 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Monitoring contributions are excessive where based on a charge per clause basis, and could lead to excessive numbers of clauses being added to S106 agreements to generate revenue. In addition, the SPD does not include any mechanism for paying back any unused contributions, and this should be set out clearly in this section.	Concerns noted. However, Circular 05/2005 does not prohibit administrative charges being levied. The good practice guidelines on planning obligations advise local authorities to ensure that sufficient resources are in place to deal with planning obligations. The Council disagrees with the assertion that an excessive number of clauses will be included in legal agreements. In terms of timescales for repayment of unspent monies, this issue is specifically referenced in paragraph B24 of Circular 05/2005. As such, it is considered that this level of detail should not be included in the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD. The timing of a rebate would depend on the precise wording of a legal agreement, which would be monitored by the Council and the developer.	
1352 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd (Miss	Object	There is no justification for developers contributing towards monitoring of S106 clauses or conditions. We are	Concerns noted. However, Circular 05/2005 does not prohibit administrative charges being levied. The good	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Joanne Clark) [326]		particularly concerned that for obligations in the Areas of Major Change it is stated that the strategy is likely to include a requirement for funding of development-specific or Area of Major Change-specific dedicated monitoring officer(s) throughout the period of implementation of development. This is wholly unreasonable and outside the scope of Circular 05/05.	practice guidelines on planning obligations advise local authorities to ensure that sufficient resources are in place to deal with planning obligations.	
1630 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>It is especially unacceptable to seek charges of £150 or £300 based upon a per clause basis. This will encourage the Local authority to make Planning Obligations as long as possible in order to obtain extra revenue. Not does the number of clauses necessarily relate to the actual complexity of individual obligations.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the £300 (infrastructure condition) is to be applied to all planning conditions. To seek to do so may well be illegal.</p>	Concerns noted. However, Circular 05/2005 does not prohibit administrative charges being levied. The good practice guidelines on planning obligations advise local authorities to ensure that sufficient resources are in place to deal with planning obligations. The Council disagrees with the assertion that an excessive number of clauses will be included in legal agreements.	
5.6				
1631 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	<p>It is especially unacceptable to seek charges of £150 or £300 based upon a per clause basis. This will encourage the Local authority to make Planning Obligations as long as possible in order to obtain extra revenue. Not does the number of clauses necessarily relate to the actual complexity of individual obligations.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the £300 (infrastructure condition) is to be applied to all planning conditions. To seek to do so may well be illegal.</p>	Concerns noted. However Circular 05/2005 does not prohibit administrative charges being levied. The good practice guidelines on planning obligations advise local authorities to ensure that sufficient resources are in place to deal with planning obligations. The Council disagrees with the assertion that an excessive number of clauses will be included in legal agreements.	

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****Council's Assessment****Action****6. Practical Points for Preparing and Completing Planning Obligations****6.2**

1262 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	Each planning application is different and subject to different complexities (land ownerships, on-site/off-site works, parties in agreement to the S106 etc). Each S106 must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The cause of delay in signing a S106 agreement may be as a result of the actions of a third party, such as a statutory undertaker. In such cases the developer should not be penalised as a result of that party's actions. Such flexibility needs to be applied in relation to the application of this paragraph.	Concerns noted. Whilst the Council endeavours to complete agreements in a timely fashion, it is recognised that the completion of legal agreements can be challenging within the standard timescales for planning applications. It is for this reason that we have included the use of the verb "may" in the final sentence of paragraph 6.2.	
6.3 1323 - Berkeley Homes [463]	Object	We object to the fifth bullet point under this paragraph because it does not state which index will be used.	Concerns noted. The following sentence will be added to the end of bullet point 5 to add clarity: "Generally, contributions will be linked to current Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Building Construction Information Service (BCIS) information, but other indexes may be used upon agreement with the Council, if it can be demonstrated they are more closely aligned with the type of works."	Insert the following text at the end of bullet point five: Generally, contributions will be linked to current Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Building Construction Information Service (BCIS) information, but other indexes may be used upon agreement with the Council, if it can be demonstrated they are more closely aligned with the type of works.
1263 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	The Council should publish their likely legal costs in relation to signing and completion of S106 agreements. This should be done to provide clarity and in the interests of openness.	Concerns noted. However, as legal costs vary on a case by case basis, this suggestion is not practical.	
1632 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205] 1340 - University of Cambridge (Mr Michael Bienias) [364]	Object	The strategy should provide that each party meets its own costs. It is the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, that is requiring applicants to sign planning obligations and it should not therefore expect applicants to meet the Local Planning Authority's costs in respect of that requirement.	Concerns noted. However, it is considered that these costs are directly related to the proposed development and should not fall on the public purse.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Appendix A				
4.1				
1470 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	There are various other references in the draft document to the need to include the PCT in general planning application consultation processes; these would need to include consultations with our Trust. This would include extending the Council's commitment to work other external organisations as set out in paragraph 4.1 of Appendix A to include working with our Trust. The Trust could also helpfully be included in the list of stakeholders set out in paragraph 4.8. This would help the Council fulfil its obligations to maintain and improve the health of the local population.	Concerns noted. The "Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust" will be included in the list of stakeholders in paragraph 4.8 of the main SPD and paragraph 4.1 of Appendix A.	Insert "Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust" at the end of sentence 2 of paragraph 4.1 of Appendix A.
1265 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	Object	Clarification of Calculations of Section 106 Contributions required:it is strongly suggested to clearly set out in this Document how the calculated contributions relate to VAT & inflation increases etc particularly where envisaged to operate over a 10 year period to ensure realistic sums are available when the scheme is actually being built and safeguarding allocated monies, where such cannot be spent within 10 year period. This to ensure allocated monies and thus benefit are not lost to the City and can be re-allocated in time.	Concerns noted. The following sentence will be added to the end of bullet point 5 of paragraph 6.3 to add clarity: "Generally, contributions will be linked to current Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Building Construction Information Service (BCIS) information, but other indexes may be used upon agreement with the Council, if it can be demonstrated they are more closely aligned with the type of works."	Add the following sentence to the end of bullet point 5 of paragraph 6.3 to add clarity: "Generally, contributions will be linked to current Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Building Construction Information Service (BCIS) information, but other indexes may be used upon agreement with the Council, if it can be demonstrated they are more closely aligned with the type of works."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4.2 1514 - Mrs Christine Clancey [478]	Object	<p>The projects put forward by Active Communities are not supported by empirical evidence.</p> <p>The criteria for assessing projects is unsound. Points awarded are not based on empirical evidence.</p> <p>The system is arbitrary in that the same people putting forward the projects are deciding what points to award it.</p> <p>There should be more emphasis on what local communities want - suggestions should come from them, not from Active Communities staff or youth workers.</p>	<p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighborhood (IYN) is a annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text discussed in the response into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

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

Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."

Table: Transport

1290 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]

Object

Appendix A page 67. Infrastructure - Select of Projects Table

In paragraph 4.2, the County Council believe that the list of strategic transport projects is not sufficiently comprehensive. It should refer to specific transport schemes that emerge from studies and strategies produced by either the County and/or the City Council. In addition, it should also mention that contributions may be required towards schemes that arise as a result of specific development proposals.

Concerns noted. However, the purpose of this table is to set out the framework by which projects are selected and progressed. Specific projects are not included within the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as the project list would not remain up to date for long.

Table: Open Space and Recreation

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Table: Open Space and Recreation</i>				
1478 - Mr David McKeown [470]	Object	The Active Communities Officer apparently uses criteria for assessing projects which ignore the true situation e.g. MUGA's have been shown to encourage anti-social behaviour when unsupervised nationally and locally, yet one positive example in Leciester is the only one quoted. The same people should not be deciding what points to award projects they have put forward in the first place. The methodology should be based on unbiased evidence. Unwavering local opposition should be a major factor in awarding points. Siting a MUGA near to where most children live and attend school would appear to be an obvious solution.	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

Table: Open Space and Recreation

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	
<i>5.4</i> 1668 - South Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Jonathan Dixon) [502]	Object	To be consistent with the comment about 3.1.13 above, the spending should not be restricted to a City wide basis but should include the Fringe/Strategic sites.	Details of affordable housing contributions are dealt with in the Council's Affordable Housing SPD. Sub-section 3.1 on Affordable Housing and this paragraph 5.4 of Appendix A have been deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD following the adoption of the Council's Affordable Housing SPD (adopted January 2008).	Delete sub-section 3.1 and paragraph 5.4 of Appendix A.
<i>5.14</i> 1468 - Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Mr Roger Cutting) [466]	Object	Paragraphs 3.5.22 and 5.14 explain that the local PCT will indicate to what project these contributions have been put. Our Trust would be pleased to give the same undertaking, and also to provide information to allow the Council to ensure transparency and accountability to the processes described in paragraph 5.6.	Noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Appendix B				
<i>Appendix B</i>				
1633 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The reference to 12 years maintenance should be deleted as it is considered contrary to national policy and it also has no apparent statutory policy justification. Indeed the Council itself refers in paragraph 2.5 of the text to the Circular's comments on maintenance payments. The reference to 12 years maintenance should therefore be deleted.	Disagree. Specifying a maintenance period is in accordance with the advice in Circular 05/2005 and DCLG's Planning Obligations Good Practice Guide (2006). Paragraph 2.15 of the Good Practice Guide states that "Details about the level of maintenance payments should be set out in the relevant SPD." This paragraph goes on to say that "The LPA should also set out in policy the expected time period for such payments...". In addition, this maintenance period follows the approach taken in the Council's 2004 Planning Obligation Strategy.	
1447 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464] 1424 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464] 1457 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464] 1456 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Generally, there is no rationale as to how these projects are related to new development in line with Circular 05/2005. They seem to be a 'wish list' of improvements across the City. The need for these projects should be clearly identified in line with Circular 05/2005. The circular states that planning obligations should never be used purely as a means of securing a 'betterment levy'. It is also unclear how up to date this list is.	Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions in Section 3.3 for Open Space and Recreation. Details of the types of projects, which are area-specific or citywide, are detailed in Section 3.3. All proposed projects are discussed with the Special Projects and Implementation team within Planning to establish which Section 106 monies should be related to proposed projects. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A: "Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is a annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements. Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways: - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p>	
		<p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	
		<p>Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 3</i> 1425 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 3, 4, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 41 are all identified as refurbishment. Refurbishment suggests that the current installation is tired and run down and needs updating. Can the City Council detail how refurbishment of an out dated installation relates directly to new development and whether the refurbishment sought is additional to the normal local authority renewal and refurbishment funding streams?	<p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the appropriate text into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 4</i> 1426 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 3, 4, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 41 are all identified as refurbishment. Refurbishment suggests that the current installation is tired and run down and needs updating. Can the City Council detail how refurbishment of an out dated installation relates directly to new development and whether the refurbishment sought is additional to the normal local authority renewal and refurbishment funding streams?	<p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is a annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	
<i>Project 6</i>				
1501 - Mrs Christine Clancey [478]	Object	Project cost should include a management element based on the impact of the project on surroundings as well as the actual project. This should include managing the impact on local residents affected.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1499 - Mrs Florence Stokes [479]	Object	I am concerned about the building plans for the park. At present it is an open space of grass and trees, tennis court and bowling green; a lung of fresh air in an area getting more built up. The costs of new plans seem very high. Is there to be more than one tennis court?	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1488 - Dr A H Charnley [474]	Object	A number of clubs or/and groups use the Nightingale Avenue Park. Some 25 varieties of birds have been	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		identified plus a rare orchid. The nature of green meadow land makes such diversity possible. Hard surface games areas exist at the nearby Netherhall specialist sports school. Any reduction in the grassland by permanent building will mean that some will not have their essential space. Which is to be eliminated? The Asian Circketers? The Chinese Footballers? The Children flying their kites?	released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1481 - Mrs Margaret Levitt [473]	Object	To summarise, we are strongly opposed to any additional hard landscaping or wired surrounds. The recreation ground should be left as it is - a green and open space.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 7</i>				
1503 - Mrs Christine Clancey [478]	Object	Project cost should include a management element based on the impact of the project on surroundings as well as the actual project. This should include managing the impact on local residents affected. Project 7 seems in breach of a covenant.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1500 - Mrs Florence Stokes [479]	Object	I am concerned about the building plans for the park. At present it is an open space of grass and tress, tennis court and bowling green; a lung of fresh air in an area getting more built up. The costs of new plans seem very high. Refurbishment of the pavillion seems very expensive as the structure is already there.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1487 - Mrs Margaret Levitt [473]	Support	We understand the plans also include the refurbishment of the pavilion and the toilets; these seem sensible. If such facilities are needed then they should be kept clean and in good repair.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 10</i>				
1435 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Project 10 - should a rowing boat storage facility be funded by new development? Can the City Council demonstrate how a rowing boat storage facility makes development acceptable in planning terms, and how new development directly affects this proposal.	<p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	
<i>Project 11</i>				
1506 - Mrs Christine Clancey [478]	Object	Project cost should include a management element based on the impact of the project on surroundings as well as the actual project. This should include managing the impact on local residents affected. Project 11: cost in comparison with Trumpington suggests a more extensive project than we have been asked to comment on.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1427 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 3, 4, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 41 are all identified as refurbishment. Refurbishment suggests that the current installation is tired and run down and needs updating. Can the City Council detail how refurbishment of an out dated installation relates directly to new development and whether the refurbishment sought is additional to the normal local authority renewal and refurbishment funding streams?	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A: "Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements. Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways: - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre.</p> <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p> <p>Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."</p>	
1670 - Mr Raymond Thompson [503]	Object	Also, I cannot see how you can spend £271,500 on refurbishment of the Pavilion. This sum looks like a complete rebuild disguised as refurbishment, which could be very good, but without seeing the detailed plans I cannot comment further.	<p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p> <p>Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."</p>				
<i>Project 20</i>				
1436 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Project 20 - Should an ice rink be funded by new development? Can the City Council demonstrate how an ice rink would make development acceptable, and how it is directly related to proposed development?	Concern noted. Appendix B is to be deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.	Delete Appendix B.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 26</i>				
1437 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Project 26 - should community sports provision in Cambridge University be funded by new development? Can the City Council demonstrate how community use of Cambridge University's site make development acceptable in planning terms and how proposed development is directly related to this project.	Concern noted. Appendix B is to be deleted from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.	Delete Appendix B

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 27</i> 1428 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 3, 4, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 41 are all identified as refurbishment. Refurbishment suggests that the current installation is tired and run down and needs updating. Can the City Council detail how refurbishment of an out dated installation relates directly to new development and whether the refurbishment sought is additional to the normal local authority renewal and refurbishment funding streams?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 28</i> 1429 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 3, 4, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 41 are all identified as refurbishment. Refurbishment suggests that the current installation is tired and run down and needs updating. Can the City Council detail how refurbishment of an out dated installation relates directly to new development and whether the refurbishment sought is additional to the normal local authority renewal and refurbishment funding streams?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

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

Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 29</i>				
1430 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 3, 4, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 41 are all identified as refurbishment. Refurbishment suggests that the current installation is tired and run down and needs updating. Can the City Council detail how refurbishment of an out dated installation relates directly to new development and whether the refurbishment sought is additional to the normal local authority renewal and refurbishment funding streams?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	
<i>Project 30</i>				
1502 - Mrs Florence Stokes [479]	Object	I am concerned about the building plans for the park. At present it is an open space of grass and tress, tennis court and bowling green; a lung of fresh air in an area getting more built up. The costs of new plans seem very high. MUGA - unfortunate name. What sort of games and if not supervised may not be safe.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1507 - Mrs Christine Clancey [478]	Object	Project cost should include a management element based on the impact of the project on surroundings aswell as the actual project. This should include managing the impact on local residents affected.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1489 - Dr A H Charnley [474]	Object	A number of clubs or/and groups use the Nightingale Avenue Park. Some 25 varieties of birds have been	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		identified plus a rare orchid. The nature of green meadow land makes such diversity possible. Hard surface games areas exist at the nearby Netherhall specialist sports school. Any reduction in the grassland by permanent building will mean that some will not have their essential space. Which is to be eliminated? The Asian Circketers? The Chinese Footballers? The Children flying their kites?	released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1483 - Mrs Margaret Levitt [473]	Object	To summarise, we are strongly opposed to any additional hard landscaping or wired surrounds. The recreation ground should be left as it is - a green and open space.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1669 - Mr Raymond Thompson [503]	Object	<p>I have just seen the proposals and costings for converting Nightingale Avenue Park into an Urban Play Area and wish to object most strongly to these proposals. In particular I object to the MUGA which is an over-development of an open green space.</p> <p>I must congratulate the Council on the improvements to the toddlers play area and the invalid access to the toilets. However, please keep the Park as a predominantly open green space and use the money to provide additional green spaces in the area. There are already plenty of sports and recreation facilities available at Netherhall and other</p>	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		colleges and parks.	Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1517 - Mr Harry Hudson [480]	Object	None of the locals who have lived in the area for some time would call the area in question the Park. It was established as a Recreation ground in the early 1960s. Park is too grandiose term for such a small area. Most would still refer to it as 'The Rec.' It has served its purpose admirably over the years and, as you suggest, it should be kept green for people and wildlife, rather than cluttered up further.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1491 - Mr Mike Humphreys-Davies [475]	Support	Thank you for your leaflet about the capital spend at the park. We very much welcome this investment and like the sound of everything, particularly the all weather MUGA for young people and more tennis courts, which are badly needed. We are pensioners but we like to see all the kids playing football etc. while we take the grandchildren to the play area. Our only problem is that we think the area will be vandalised or used late at night for parties. Last year, the play area was full of drinking etc late at night. Perhaps you should lock the gates at night or have a warden.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 33</i>				
1431 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 3, 4, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 41 are all identified as refurbishment. Refurbishment suggests that the current installation is tired and run down and needs updating. Can the City Council detail how refurbishment of an out dated installation relates directly to new development and whether the refurbishment sought is additional to the normal local authority renewal and refurbishment funding streams?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 34</i> 1432 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 3, 4, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 41 are all identified as refurbishment. Refurbishment suggests that the current installation is tired and run down and needs updating. Can the City Council detail how refurbishment of an out dated installation relates directly to new development and whether the refurbishment sought is additional to the normal local authority renewal and refurbishment funding streams?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

Representations

Nature Summary of Main Issue

Council's Assessment

Action

Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 38</i> 1433 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 3, 4, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 41 are all identified as refurbishment. Refurbishment suggests that the current installation is tired and run down and needs updating. Can the City Council detail how refurbishment of an out dated installation relates directly to new development and whether the refurbishment sought is additional to the normal local authority renewal and refurbishment funding streams?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 39</i> 1438 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Project 39 - should safer routes to play be funded by development? Most of these routes will be on the public highway. The local highway authority is obliged to ensure that routes are safe.	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 41</i> 1434 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 3, 4, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 41 are all identified as refurbishment. Refurbishment suggests that the current installation is tired and run down and needs updating. Can the City Council detail how refurbishment of an out dated installation relates directly to new development and whether the refurbishment sought is additional to the normal local authority renewal and refurbishment funding streams?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

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

Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 56</i>				
1291 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	Appendix B page 82. Strategic Open Space table: Additional projects should be included.	<p>Concerns noted. However, all references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is a annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this</p>	<p>Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.</p> <p>Delete all references to Strategic Open Space.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p> <p>Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 57</i> 1439 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Project 57 - should development pay for landscape improvements in Histon Road cemetery? This cemetery takes few new burials, and is either 'closed' or likely to be 'closed' soon. What improvements are proposed and can the City Council be specific as to what impact new development has to require these improvements?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 58</i>				
1440 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Project 58 - can the City Council be specific as to what impact new development has to require tree planting on Christ's Pieces? Is there funding through current budgets to undertake this sort of work?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	
<i>Project 60</i>				
1267 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	Support	we support this Strategic Open Space as one of the Informal Green Spaces we manage to the fringes of the City. With reference to the Green Infrastructure (Project U - Coton Countryside Reserve) we are in the progress to finalise outline costings for the provision and maintenance of the various visitor facilities (car park phases, Reserve Centre, improved countryside access and linkage with the City etc). Please liaise with us to agree suitable allocations for the various schemes.	Support noted. However, Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date and all references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Delete Appendix B and all references to Strategic Open Space.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 61</i>				
1441 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Project 61 - can the City Council be specific as to what impact new development has to require the installation of railings onto St Albans Recreation ground?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 62</i>				
1442 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 62, 63, 64, 65 and 66 - can the City Council be specific as to what impact new development has to require these improvements?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

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

Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 63</i>				
1443 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 62, 63, 64, 65 and 66 - can the City Council be specific as to what impact new development has to require these improvements?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	
<i>Project 64</i>				
1508 - Mrs Christine Clancey [478]	Object	Project cost should include a management element based on the impact of the project on surroundings as well as the actual project. This should include managing the impact on local residents affected.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1671 - Mr Raymond Thompson [503]	Object	A peripheral path could be a useful improvement for the elderly and mothers with prams, but care must be taken to ensure it cannot be used as a race track.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1504 - Mrs Florence Stokes [479]	Object	I am concerned about the building plans for the park. At present it is an open space of grass and tress, tennis court	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>and bowling green; a lung of fresh air in an area getting more built up.</p> <p>The costs of new plans seem very high.</p> <p>Peripheral path may be used as a racing track for bicycles.</p> <p>Perhaps resurfacing the pavement along Nightingale Avenue alongside the park would be more beneficial to more people as it is cracked and uneven.</p>	<p>released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.</p>	
1484 - Mrs Margaret Levitt [473]	Object	To summarise, we are strongly opposed to any additional hard landscaping or wired surrounds. The recreation ground should be left as it is - a green and open space.	<p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.</p>	
1444 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 62, 63, 64, 65 and 66 - can the City Council be specific as to what impact new development has to require these improvements?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1490 - Dr A H Charnley [474]	<p>Object A number of clubs or/and groups use the Nightingale Avenue Park. Some 25 varieties of birds have been identified plus a rare orchid. The nature of green meadow land makes such diversity possible. Hard surface games areas exist at the nearby Netherhall specialist sports school. Any reduction in the grassland by permanent building will mean that some will not have their essential space. Which is to be eliminated? The Asian Circketers? The Chinese Footballers? The Children flying their kites?</p>	<p>delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p> <p>Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."</p>	<p>The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 65</i>				
1445 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 62, 63, 64, 65 and 66 - can the City Council be specific as to what impact new development has to require these improvements?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1485 - Mrs Margaret Levitt [473]	Object	To summarise, we are strongly opposed to any additional hard landscaping or wired surrounds. The recreation ground should be left as it is - a green and open space.	Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."	
1509 - Mrs Christine Clancey [478]	Object	This project is incorrectly described (as improving lighting when it will be installing new lighting, where none now exists) and will have an adverse effect on neighbouring houses. Lighting this car park would prolong people congregating there, where playing loud music has become a problem.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1505 - Mrs Florence Stokes [479]	Object	I am concerned about the building plans for the park. At present it is an open space of grass and tress, tennis court and bowling green; a lung of fresh air in an area getting more built up. The costs of new plans seem very high.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Why does the car park need lighting - cars have headlights?	multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1477 - Mr David McKeown [470]	Object	The car park in Nightingale Avenue has never been lit and is for Park users only. Newly installed lighting would encourage anti-social noise and create light pollution to houses adjacent to the car park. I suggest a lockable gate is put on the car park. This would relieve the police from their regular checks on the occupants of the car park at night. The park including the car park used to be locked at night and I note that many other parks are locked at night.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	
1672 - Mr Raymond Thompson [503]	Object	Improvements to the car park lighting, unless very carefully done, could only contribute to light pollution.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. It is noted that the draft SPD released for consultation in 2007 made reference to proposed works to Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. It is understood that works to install a further tennis court, a multi use games area and a footpath around the periphery of the open space are almost complete. Appendix B of the draft SPD is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. Whilst the concerns about individual projects such as those regarding Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground have been noted, this SPD cannot address individual project details and operational matters. In the event of further concerns about the	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			development of Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, queries should be directed to the Council's Active Communities section.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Project 66</i>				
1446 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Projects 62, 63, 64, 65 and 66 - can the City Council be specific as to what impact new development has to require these improvements?	<p>Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular is given below and will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A:</p> <p>"Improve Your Neighbourhood (IYN) is an annual programme developed by the City Council to encourage and coordinate delivery of suggestions for new recreation and open space projects in the City. If approved, projects then form part of the Council's Open Space and Recreation programme, which uses planning obligation contributions to fund improvements.</p> <p>Individuals, groups, councillors and council officers can submit IYN ideas in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filling in a form in the Customer Service Centre or local community facilities; - Filling in a form via the IYN page on the Council website; - Telephoning the Customer Service Centre. <p>Ideas can be submitted at any time of the year and are assessed each Autumn before consideration by Area Committees. A working group made up of sections across the Council makes an initial assessment of a project's viability. These assessments form the basis for recommendations made to each relevant Area Committee and eventually via scrutiny to the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation. Even at this point, the proposals are still only ideas, and their inclusion on the Open Space & Recreation Programme means that further work in consulting stakeholders, including local residents, and assessing viability and costs can be undertaken. After this more extensive analysis, the scheme may then be brought forward as a project appraisal for scrutiny and financial commitment.</p> <p>A schedule for the remaining open space and recreation programme will be prepared by March the following year. This will indicate when work will be undertaken to consider and potentially move projects forward.</p>	Delete Appendix B and insert the text on the IYN programme into the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>Officers attend Area Committees in the spring cycle to discuss lists of potential IYN schemes with ward councillors and local people."</p>				
<p><i>Project Management Fees</i></p>				
1176 - unex holdings limited (Mr stephen walsh) [445]	Object	The project management fees are far too high and do not reflect the real world. The consultation fees should be deleted.	The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. With regard to project management fees, despite the deletion of Appendix B for the reasons given above, the fees are considered reasonable and proportional to the value and complexity of projects.	
<p><i>Process for Review of Open Space Project List</i></p>				
1266 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	Object	The Society welcomes inclusion of the Coton Countryside Reserve being highlighted in Green Infrastructure Strategy and thus Section 106 support. However equally it is felt that the also as high priority rated Gog Magog Countryside Project (G in GIS) should be included encompassing Strategic Open Spaces such as Magog Down and Wandlebury Country Park. In addition existing nearby Strategic Open Spaces to fringes of the City should be added as they serve the urban population as major recreational & wildlife resources - such as Milton Country Park, Magog Down, Wandlebury Country Park and the Coton Countryside Reserve.	Concerns noted. However, all references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Delete all references to strategic open space.

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

Appendix C

Appendix C

1634 - Home Builders Federation (Mr Paul Cronk) [205]	Object	The reference to 12 years maintenance should be deleted as it is considered contrary to national policy and it also has no apparent statutory policy justification. Indeed the Council itself refers in paragraph 2.5 of the text to the Circular's comments on maintenance payments. The reference to 12 years maintenance should therefore be deleted.	Disagree. Specifying a maintenance period is in accordance with the advice in Circular 05/2005 and DCLG's Planning Obligations Good Practice Guide (2006). Paragraph 2.15 of the Good Practice Guide states that "Details about the level of maintenance payments should be set out in the relevant SPD." This paragraph goes on to say that "The LPA should also set out in policy the expected time period for such payments...". In addition, this 12 year period replicates the Council's approach in our 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy.	
1448 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464] 1378 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Circular 05/2005 is quite clear. Where an asset is intended for wider public use the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developers contribution should normally be borne by the authority in which the asset is to be invested. It is not reasonable to pass on the maintenance requirements for facilities which are intended for wider public use to new development when local public sector funding streams should be in place from extant development and increasingly as new development becomes occupied. The cost of maintenance should be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested.	Disagree. Circular 05/2005 makes it clear within paragraph B18 that it acceptable to ask for maintenance contributions as part of a planning obligations strategy. In addition, the Planning Obligations Practice Guide (CLG, 2006) also makes it clear at paragraph 2.15 that it is appropriate to specify a reasonable period for maintenance contributions within an SPD. It should also be noted that in referring to paragraph 2.5 of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, the objector has missed out the reference at the start of the paragraph that where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance. Elements of the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD must not be read in isolation, but the document should be read as a whole.	
<i>1. Outdoor & Indoor Sports Facilities</i>				
1449 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	These facilities will be used by the wider public. Therefore maintenance costs should not be included. Can the City Council explain why the cost of 12 years maintenance of a tennis court is given as £60,000? In Appendix B the cost of 12 years maintenance for a tennis court is given as £13,000. Why is there such a discrepancy?	Concerns noted. Given the time elapsed between consultation and adoption, the Council has deleted Appendix B. Furthermore, capital and maintenance costs have been updated.	
1519 - Sport England (Mr Phillip Raiswell) [210]	Support	Sport England's own Sports Facility Calculator (SFC) can be used to estimate the demand for sports facilities and the cost of providing these facilities. In this instance the cost of providing for a single person for halls and pools is estimated at £297 in Cambridge, therefore the figure	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		quoted for indoor sports facilities of £245 per person is fairly close to the figure generated by the SFC.		
3. Informal Open Space				
1450 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	In the table 'Costings for 0.8 ha site', the costs listed assume the complete and new creation of informal open space. However the strategy indicates at paragraph 3.3.12 that it is likely that it will not be possible to provide some types of natural greenspaces on development sites, other than the urban extensions. Most open spaces are likely to be provided by the developers of the urban extensions. Appendix B sets out a schedule which includes outdoor and indoor sports facilities mostly on City Council owned property. Category C covers provision for children's and teenager's play areas. Many of these items are for refurbishment. How can it be shown that the normal wear and tear of play facilities be directly attributable to new development? Circular 05/2005 advises that a 'reasonable obligation will seek to restore features, resources and amenities to a quality equivalent to that existing before the development'. If the facilities are run down before the development contribution to refurbishment of facilities could be seen as a 'betterment levy'. Category D covers informal open space. Many of the projects listed here can not be directly related to proposed development, and many should be covered by extant public sector funding streams for provision, repair and renewal.	Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. In relation to Appendix C, capital and maintenance costs have been updated, given the time that has elapsed since consultation.	
1264 - Ashwell Developments Ltd (Ms Jennifer Smith) [454]	Object	In relation to the costings for 0.8 ha site, the areas attached to those elements to be supplied equate to 0.92 hectares of space and not 0.8 hectares. Therefore the amount required is too much and should be reduced accordingly.	Disagree. The calculation is based on those elements presented in metres squared, hence the figure of 0.8ha. While the inclusion of elements such as paths, hedges and footpaths does bring the area to 0.92 ha, this does not take account of the fact that these features are normally provided within the area encompassed by the other features. As such, no change is required to the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD.	
1452 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	The costings seem to be a wish list of trying to squeeze every possible requirement into the space and do not seem to demonstrate the reality of creating an informal open space. Can the City Council substantiate these requirements for informal open space? We cite the following as examples: 1. The full area requirement is taken up by the first 4 categories - grass/pasture - mown grass - shrub - woodland / aquatic. In addition there is a pond. Where does the	Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. In relation to Appendix C, capital and maintenance costs have been	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>pond fit in? Is this double counting with aquatic provision?</p> <p>2. Features are included. What are features? These features add up to £44,000.</p> <p>3. In total 900 linear metres of cyclist and pedestrian paths are proposed. This is the equivalent of paths criss-crossing from one side of the area to another nine times. Why are so many path crossings proposed?</p> <p>4. Ten benches are proposed. Why so many in such a small space?</p> <p>5. The maintenance of cyclist/pedestrian paths is given at £36 per linear metre. The maintenance of footpaths is given at £6.00 per linear metre. Why is there such a discrepancy? Compare this to Project 64 where the capital sum of £80,000 is given to provide a path in Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground with only a requirement of £6,000 maintenance. (These figures bear no relationship to the costings given for 0.8ha site - taking the figures given for a cyclist/pedestrian path for a capital expenditure of £80,000 a maintenance sum of £95,040 would be required. Can the City Council explain these discrepancies?)</p> <p>As already indicated, the strategy indicates the contributions for off-site open space will be used on existing City Council managed sites. Funding streams are already in place for the maintenance of these facilities and there should therefore be no requirement for maintenance or the developer would therefore be taking over a maintenance requirement which should be funded from current and future public sector funding streams.</p>	updated, given the time that has elapsed since consultation.	
1451 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	<p>Directly referring to the costings - these are for the creation of the open space on a 'virgin' site. There does not appear to be any programme for the Council to create new areas of open space, and consequently it is deduced that most of opportunities will present themselves on current City Council managed sites which already have habitats including grass and meadow land, hedges and trees, and should have public sector funding streams in place for maintenance, repair and renewal. While it is accepted there has to be a sense of balance between developers who provide and directly fund open space on site with those who provide contributions, the result of off site contributions based on establishing new open space on 'virgin' sites will very likely be an overprovision of contributions to the Council - which they will not be able to spend.</p>	Concerns noted. The Planning Obligations Strategy SPD sets out the framework for contributions. Appendix B is to be deleted as the list of projects is now out of date. Whilst the concerns about individual projects have been noted, this SPD is not the arena to address individual project details and operational matters. The route by which projects will be identified and progressed for open spaces in particular will be included in the Table after 4.2 in Appendix A. In relation to Appendix C, capital and maintenance costs have been updated, given the time that has elapsed since consultation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>4. Strategic Open Space</i>				
1292 - Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Sharp) [462]	Object	<p>Appendix C page 85. Section 4 Strategic Open Space: Below 'Costings from County....', the County Council suggest the following should be added:</p> <p>"This can be divided between: Establishment Costings: £450/dwelling (£188/person) Maintenance Costings: £730/dwelling (£306/person)"</p> <p>It would also be useful to show the establishment:maintenance costs split. This becomes relevant when a commuted sum provides for the measures to increase the capacity of an existing facility, as establishment costs are not needed.</p>	Concerns noted. However, all references to Strategic Open Space will be removed from the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD as a result of concerns raised about the evidence base on Strategic Open Space during the examinations into South Cambridgeshire District Council's Northstowe Area Action Plan and Development Control Development Plan Document.	Delete all references to Strategic Open Space
<i>5. Allotments</i>				
1454 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	Why is 800 metres of fencing required on a 0.4 ha site? To provide boundary fencing for 0.4 ha approximately 280 metres of fencing would be required. Why is 800 metres specified? The linear cost of the fencing seems very high. Can the City Council specify what type of fencing is to be used and justify the cost?	Concerns noted. Capital and maintenance costs have been updated.	
1453 - Bidwells (Mr Nick Ward) [464]	Object	The figures given do not seem to add up. The total for provision and 12 year maintenance is £160,000. Can the City Council be clearer as to how these figures have been arrived at? Further clarification is also required in relation to water supply. Is this a supply to each allotment? How much hard standing is proposed? Why is collected and recycled water not being used? The figure of £40,000 for hard standing and water supply to a 0.4 ha site seems very high.	Concerns noted. Capital and maintenance costs have been updated.	

Sustainability Appraisal of the Planning Obligations SPD

Public Participation Report

Appendix 1

Appendix 1

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

Appendix 1

Appendix 1

1476 - English Heritage (East of England Region) (Katharine Fletcher) [234]

Object

The Sustainability Appraisal indicators for the historic environment could be refined to reflect information more closely associated with the planning process. The number of listed buildings and the percentage of the city which is conservation area will not change in a meaningful way over time. Perhaps the number of historic designations adversely affected by planning permissions could be monitored. Finding a good measure for quality in the built environment is also difficult and we hope that indicators can be used which assess the physical fabric in a qualitative sense.

Agree that in some instances the indicators for the historic environment are not ideal, although the refinement of indicators is not for this stage in the Sustainability Appraisal process but is more suited to Stage A of the process and the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The City Council will be reviewing its Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and this may provide the opportunity for new indicators related to the historic environment to be incorporated, including qualitative information where this is readily available. However, it is not for the Scoping Report process to monitor the indicator suggested; this would more appropriately be monitored through other mechanisms resources permitting.
