



South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework

**Health Impact Assessment  
Orchard Park Design Guidance  
Supplementary Planning Documents**

**Statement of Consultation**

**March 2011**

---

**03450 450 500**

**[www.scambs.gov.uk](http://www.scambs.gov.uk)**



## **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This statement has been developed to provide information relating to how the representations received to the following Supplementary Plan Documents (SPD) have been considered in accordance with Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 - Regulation 18(4):

- Health Impact Assessment
- Orchard Park Design Guidance

1.2 The SPDs have not been subject to a full Sustainability Appraisal as the parent policies in the adopted Development Plan Documents have been fully appraised and it is not possible for an SPD to create new policy.

1.3 A Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA / SEA) Statement has been prepared to this effect. The preparation of the SPDs has been subject to public participation in accordance with Regulation 17.

1.4 This statement sets out the following information for the public consultation:

- A summary of the main issues raised in representations received during the public consultation; and
- How these issues have been addressed in the SPDs.

## **2. CONSULTATION OVERVIEW**

2.1 A six-week period of public consultation on the Orchard Park Design Guidance SPD and its associated Sustainability Appraisal Statement was undertaken between 6 September and 18 October 2010. A six-week public consultation on the Health Impact Assessment SPD and its associated Sustainability Appraisal Statement took place between 29 October and 10 December 2010. For each consultation the Council set up an interactive website to assist access to the documents and to facilitate making responses online.

2.2 A total of 102 representations were received on the SPDs. No representations were received on the Sustainability Appraisal Statements or Habitat Regulations Assessment Statements. One comment was received on the Equality Impact Assessment for the Orchard Park SPD. The breakdown of these representations is shown in the table below.

### Breakdown of representations received to the SPDs:

SPD	Support	Object	Comment	Total
Health Impact Assessment SPD	1	2	0	3
Orchard Park SPD	1	64	33	98
Orchard Park SPD Equality Impact Assessment	0	0	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>102</b>

### Summary of the main issues raised to the Health Impact Assessment SPD:

- Support from NHS Cambridgeshire - in particular because it highlights the social aspects of health and the importance of social infrastructure in contributing to the mental wellbeing of a community. These are aspects that have often got overlooked in the planning process where usually only physical aspects have been considered. This aspect is further supported in the forthcoming Joint Strategic Needs Assessment on New Communities (2010) which contains a section on the social environment. The executive summary of this is contained in the Phase 4 Cambridgeshire JSNA Summary document that has been recently published.
- Objection to the duplication of guidance and good practice set out in other policy documents, which will add further bureaucracy, cost and delay. PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth) is recent guidance and if health impact was considered to be important it would have been included as an area to address. It would go against the advice of the Killian Pretty review which notes the amount and type of information that has been needed to support planning applications has substantially increased and become more complex.
- A suggested amendment to paragraph 2.10 to make it clear that Environmental Impact Assessment and Health Impact Assessment do not necessarily need to be integrated together in the same document.

### Summary of the main issues raised to the Orchard Park Design Guidance SPD:

- The document should be robust and comprehensive with strengthened vision and objectives, and past mistakes should not be repeated.
- The identification of various factual errors in the document and requests for clarity.

- The validity of Policy SP/1 to allow up to an additional 220 residential units on Orchard Park was questioned in light of the intended revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy.
- Concerns were raised over the possible location of residential premises on sites alongside the A14, in close proximity to the sources of noise and poor air quality arising from the traffic on the A14.
- Issues around the noise barrier; that it could not be fully funded through developer contributions and other sources of funding should be sought; and clear design principles should be stated for any replacement barrier. There was also both support and opposition to screening the A14 embankment with landscaping.
- Criticism the Council is not seeking sufficiently high levels of sustainability on new developments and should also address climate change issues.
- Concern about the problem of on-street car parking, as the roads in Orchard Park have not been adopted and criticism of car parking standards and how it is addressed.
- Suggestions that cycle parking and storage should be well located and secure; and garages should be designed to allow cycle parking in them as well as car parking.
- Requests for a high quality public realm, with minimal street clutter, linkages to adjacent developments and with pedestrians and cycles having priority, support for the provision of public art and that reference should be made to the importance of green spaces and play spaces.
- Various detailed comments on section 6 concerning specific land parcels.
- Requests for greater detail of landscape requirements, especially breaking up car parking areas with landscaping, but mixed views on the reference that up to 20% of a site to be landscaping.
- Objections to the use of green walls, concerned about the difficulty of establishing them. There were both objections and support for the use of green roofs.
- Requests that bin storages be accessible, practical and suitable to accommodate the Council's requirements for bins.

- Objection that the SPD gives no recognition of the Government's aim of 'localism' and how the existing community will help the Council achieve the vision for Orchard Park and another that localism and involving the existing community should be an objective.

**How these issues have been addressed:**

- 2.3 The following schedules for each SPD provide a summary all of the representations received in plan order together with any suggested change to the text of the SPD, the Council's assessment of them and, where appropriate, proposes amendments to the text of the draft SPDs.
- 2.4 The proposed changes to the SPDs and their impact on sustainability have been considered by the Council at a New Communities Portfolio Holder meeting on 8 March 2011 as part of the process of formally adopting the revised SPDs.

# Health Impact Assessment Supplementary Planning Document

## Public Participation Report

1. Introduction to the Supplementary Planning Document and Legislative Policy

1.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<b>1. Introduction to the Supplementary Planning Document and Legislative Policy</b>				
<b>1.1</b>				
29186 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Limited	Object	<p>This SPD should not be pursued. It duplicates guidance and good practice set out in other policy documents and will serve only to cause delay, additional cost and create further bureaucracy.</p> <p>Policy EC 10.2 of PPS4 sets out a series of impact considerations against which new economic development must be considered. PPS4 is recent guidance and if health impact was considered to be important, it would have been included as an area to address.</p> <p>It would go against the advice of the Killian Pretty review. In particular section 2.2 notes that the amount and type of information that has been needed to support a planning application has substantially increased and become more complex.</p>	<p>Supplementary Planning Documents are not able to create policy, rather they provide guidance on the implementation of policies in the Council's adopted Development Plan Documents. The requirement for a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is set out in Policy DP/1 in the Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007). This states that for major developments, applicants must submit a Sustainability Statement and Health Impact Assessment, to demonstrate that the principles of sustainable development have been applied. Although there is already general guidance available, the Health Impact Assessment SPD seeks to help developers fulfill their requirement to submit an HIA, where needed, outlining what SCDC expects an HIA to address. HIA considers more than the economic aspects of developments and it is important that all the potential impacts and benefits to health are taken account when permitting and building new developments.</p>	No change.
29183 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Support	<p>NHS Cambridgeshire is in support of this Health Impact Assessment SPD - in particular because it highlights the social aspects of health and the importance of social infrastructure in contributing to the mental wellbeing of a community. These are aspects that have often got overlooked in the planning process where usually only physical aspects have been considered. This aspect is further supported in the forthcoming JSNA on New Communities (2010) which contains a section on the social environment. The executive summary of this is contained in the Phase 4 Cambridgeshire JSNA Summary document that has been recently published.</p>	<p>Support noted - The forthcoming Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) on New Communities will be a valuable tool to be considered by future applicants of new developments.</p>	No change.

**Representations****Nature Summary of Main Issue****Council's Assessment****Action****2. What is Health Impact Assessment?****2.10**

29187 - Gallagher Estates

Object

Paragraph 2.10 should be amended to make it clear that EIA and HIA do necessarily need to be integrated together in the same document. It is not a requirement of the assessment process the local authority will be using referred to in paragraph 4.1 and Appendix 3 or a requirement set out in any of the References or Further Reading identified in Appendix 1. Gallagher raised this matter with the local authority in a letter dated 29 November 2007. The legal advice attached to that letter sets out the relationship between HIA and EIA and our understanding is that the principles still apply.

It is suggested that the first sentence of paragraph 2.10 is amended to say "...(EIA) it may make sense to integrate..."

This is a valid comment. Paragraph 2.10 should be amended accordingly but with clarification as to the council's preferred approach.

Amend paragraph 2.10 to read: "For those development proposals that are already required to submit an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) it may make sense to integrate health impacts into the EIA rather than duplicate the assessments as the methodology is very similar and there is a large overlap in the evidence gathered and used in both assessments. The Council's preferred approach is for Health Impact Assessments to be integrated with other similar assessments to ensure the HIA is wide ranging and has adequately examined all the potential health impacts of a development. It also makes it easier to cross reference the impacts helping to ensure the HIA is comprehensive. At the outset it needs to be made clear that environmental impacts are not health impacts. When carrying out the screening and scoping stages for both the HIA and the EIA, it is important to be ensure that:"

# *Orchard Park Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document*

## *Public Participation Report*

1. Introduction

1. Introduction

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<b><i>1. Introduction</i></b>				
<i>1. Introduction</i>				
29012 - Cambridge City Council	Comment	<p>The City Council considers that there is much that can be supported in the SPD. However, in the interest of conciseness we have not identified all the guidance with which we are in agreement and so support.</p> <p>The document is repetitive and it is considered that the text in the SPD could be more concise, especially in the introductory sections. More specific essential criteria in Section 6 Site Specific Design Principles would give the document significantly more strength in working with developers than at present.</p>	<p>In addressing the representations every opportunity has been taken to strengthen the document structure and remove unnecessary repetition.</p> <p>Section 6 is intended to illustrate only the key principles for the design of land parcels that would apply to any development proposal. More detailed direction would only be pertinent to a specific design for a specific use and will vary from scheme to scheme and are therefore not appropriate for inclusion on the figure illustrating the key principles.</p>	<p>In addressing the representations every opportunity has been taken to strengthen the document structure and remove unnecessary repetition.</p>

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

*Purpose & Scope*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29050 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	Whilst the Community Council welcomes the concept of updated Design Guidance for the undeveloped land parcels in Orchard Park, it does not believe that the current draft document is sufficiently comprehensive or as robust as it could be. There is no recognition within the document of the coalition government's aims for localism and how the involvement of the existing community will help and guide South Cambridgeshire District Council in the formation and achievement of the vision for Orchard Park. It is very important that mistakes from initial development phases are considered in developing principles for undeveloped plots.	<p>The subsequent representations are regarded as indicating where it is considered the draft SPD is insufficiently comprehensive and those matters are addressed as they arise.</p> <p>The Council is considering corporately how to embrace the Coalition Government's localism agenda, which will emerge and develop over time and will influence how we engage with the community on planning matters. However, the Council considers that its partnership approach to Orchard Park with key stakeholders over a number of years is consistent with the spirit of localism and this has been reflected in the way that the SPD has been prepared and consulted on, including with the Orchard Park Community Council, local residents and landowners. The Council intends to continue to work in partnership in relation to development proposals for the remaining land parcels that will be brought forward by developers.</p> <p>The Orchard Park Design Guidance SPD has been prepared with due regard to the recommendations of the "Arbury Park Scrutiny Review Final Report October 2008". The preparation of the Orchard Park Design Guidance SPD is in accordance with recommendation 1e of the "Arbury Park Scrutiny Review Final Report October 2008" to provide design guidance for "design aspects not covered in the main Design Guide".</p>	<p>Amend and add to paragraphs 1.4. - 1.6. to read: 1.4. The specific purpose of this SPD is to set out the design principles the Council expects to be addressed by developers in any planning application, to ensure the creation of a high quality desirable 'place', for the remaining undeveloped land parcels at Orchard Park. The SPD will provide a clear framework that will assist in the assessment of applications. The land parcels as referred to on the approved masterplan for Orchard Park are COM 2a, COM 2b, COM 3, COM 4 and L2, along the northern boundary adjacent to the A14, K1, at the eastern end of Orchard Park fronting onto Kings Hedges Road, and Q and HRCC, in the south-west corner of Orchard Park fronting Kings Hedges Road and Cambridge Road. Land parcels E3, E4, G and H1, although currently vacant, are not included in this SPD as development on these land parcels is addressed in the existing guidance set out in the Arbury Camp design Guide.</p> <p>1.5. The SPD provides design direction that is not land use specific and will apply to any development proposals that may come forward for these land parcels. Appropriate land uses for the remaining parcels will be determined having regard to the planning policy framework and the design principles. It is for the developer to undertake the necessary studies to adequately demonstrate that the development proposals being presented are fully appropriate for their location.</p> <p>1.6. Based on the requirements of the Site Specific Policies DPD (2010) and good practice design principles the future development of the sites at Orchard Park presents an opportunity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- assist in meeting the demand for housing in South Cambridgeshire;</li> <li>- integrate new development with the existing community and development;</li> <li>- introduce sustainable design solutions to address the social, economic, transportation, construction and landscape issues pertinent to Orchard Park; and, create high quality development to ensure viable and vibrant buildings and spaces.</li> </ul>

***Representations******Nature Summary of Main Issue******Council's Assessment******Action***

In Section 1 add a new paragraph to read:  
 1.10. The Council's Core Strategy, adopted January 2007, states "taking a sustainable approach to economic, social and environmental issues will be at the heart of the plan and will be closely related to the national strategy for sustainable development which has four objectives:  
 - Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;  
 - Effective protection and enhancement of the environment;  
 - Prudent use of natural resources; and  
 - Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment."

In Section 1 add a new paragraph to read:  
 1.12. During the preparation of the SPD full regard has been taken to the recommendations made by the "Arbury Park Scrutiny Review Final Report October 2008". The preparation of this SPD is in accordance with recommendation 1e of the "Arbury Park Scrutiny Review Final Report October 2008" to provide design guidance for "design aspects not covered in the main Design Guide".

In Section 1 add a new paragraph to read:  
 Working in Partnership  
 1.13. The preparation of the Orchard Park Design Guidance SPD has been undertaken in consultation with the Council's primary partners, the Orchard Park Community Council, who formally took on local parish responsibilities for the new community on 1st April 2009, the land owners, Gallagher Estates, Unex Holdings Limited and Cambridge City Council and with local residents. The Council intends to continue to work with its partners, generally and specifically, to facilitate the completion of the development at Orchard Park. South Cambridgeshire District Council urges developers to fully embrace the partnership approach and engage with the Council, and the Orchard Park community through the Orchard Park Community Council, from the outset of formulating development proposals.

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

*Policy Background*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29051 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	<p>Since the draft document was produced the Secretary of State has revoked all Regional Spatial Strategies. Consequently the East of England Plan that led to the allocation of additional sites for housing cannot be assumed to be valid without further testing. The Community Council believes that it is necessary for SCDC to carry out work in regard to land uses and to test any proposed uses against environmental issues. As part of the consideration of a change of land use, further consideration should be given to any loss of employment provision within Orchard Park for a cohesive, mixed development.</p>	<p>The Secretary of State's revocation of Regional Spatial strategies was overturned by the High court in November 2010 and they remain part of the statutory development plan until such time as they are formally abolished when the Localism Bill becomes law, assuming that is the case. Notwithstanding, the Council's Local Development Framework including the Core Strategy 2007 and Site Specific Policies DPD 2010 are statutory documents and the Core Strategy sets the development strategy for the area and the housing target to 2016. They were independently tested through public examination and concluded to be sound as adopted, having regard to the evidence supporting them. All Councils in the Cambridge sub-region, including South Cambridgeshire, have reaffirmed their shared commitment to the development strategy for the area that underpins the LDF and was contained in the Structure Plan 2003 and carried forward to the East of England Plan to address the identified needs of the sub-region.</p> <p>The Council considered all relevant factors affecting the potential for further residential development at Orchard Park when it carried out work to address a housing shortfall in the context of the Site Specific Policies DPD examination. This was subject to public consultation and all responses were taken into account by the Council and subsequently by the independent planning inspectors holding the examination. That detailed process concluded, on the basis of the evidence, that the suitability of the three land parcels for residential development was established. The sites are included as part of the Council's housing land supply for the period to 2016. The policy allocating Orchard Park for development makes clear that any planning applications must include noise, air quality and transport assessments to demonstrate in detail that the proposal is acceptable and can provide an appropriate residential environment. All planning applications for development proposals will be determined on their individual merits, having regard to the Council's adopted policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and other material factors.</p>	<p>In Section 1 add a new paragraph to read: 1.9. The Secretary of State has indicated the Government's intention to revoke the Regional Spatial Strategy, however they remain part of the statutory development plan until such time as they are formally abolished when the Localism Bill becomes law, assuming that is the case. The Council's Local Development Framework including the Core Strategy, 2007 and Site Specific Policies DPD 2010 are statutory documents and the Core Strategy sets the development strategy for the area and the housing target to 2016. They were independently tested through public examination and concluded to be sound as adopted, having regard to the evidence supporting them. All Councils in the Cambridge sub-region, including South Cambridgeshire, have reaffirmed their shared commitment to the development strategy for the area that underpins the LDF and was contained in the Structure Plan 2003 and carried forward to the East of England Plan to address the identified needs of the sub-region.</p> <p>In Section 1 add a new paragraph to read: 1.12. During the preparation of the SPD full regard has been taken to the recommendations made by the "Arbury Park Scrutiny Review Final Report October 2008". The preparation of this SPD is in accordance with recommendation 1e of the "Arbury Park Scrutiny Review Final Report October 2008" to provide design guidance for "design aspects not covered in the main Design</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>1.7</i>				
29299 - Highways Agency	Comment	<p>Consideration should be given to the internalisation of the trip rates within the site.</p> <p>The transport work undertaken from the Site Specific Policies DPD indicated that the change in patterns of movement was likely to be able to be accommodated on the road network, but this will need to be tested in detail in the transport assessment accompanying planning applications.</p> <p>Justification will need to be provided to consider what the net impact, if any, will be on the A14 mainline and its respective junctions identified within this SPD following reconfiguration of the parcels of land from commercial to residential development.</p>	Comments noted.	Non Required.
<hr/>				
<i>1.10</i>				
29298 - Highways Agency	Comment	<p>The evidence base for the Orchard Park Transport Assessment trip generation assumptions were agreed by the Highways Agency in 2004 and the policy requires an up to date transport assessment to be submitted with any planning applications.</p> <p>The expectation falls upon the developers to come forward with initiatives that will resolve development related traffic increases from impacting on the A14, achieving nil-detriment to current conditions.</p> <p>The original transport assessment will need to be reconfigured to accommodate the increase in dwellings, the reduction of non-residential floorspace and compare with previous target figure of daily trips identified in the 2003 Transport Assessment.</p>	Comments noted.	None Required.

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

***2. Background***

2.5

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29127 - Unex Holdings Limited	Comment	<p>Wording is likely to prevent development coming forward. The Council already decided the barrier carries "unacceptable adverse impact".</p> <p>Landowners paid for the existing noise barrier, it would be unreasonable to pay for replacement. The existing barrier meets technical requirements (visual grounds for replacement). Existing barrier was approved by the Council.</p> <p>The Council is aware that the fall in the property market caused the development to grind to a halt. Viability remains a major issue.</p> <p>If A14 upgrading occurs, the Highways Agency requires to replace existing barrier with one "higher longer and repositioned".</p>	<p>1. Policy SP/1 in the Site Specific Policies DPD, adopted January 2010, states:</p> <p>2.d. "The retention of an attractive urban edge to Cambridge through the use of high standards of design and landscaping and the creation of gateway features:"</p> <p>2.f. "..... Where any part of the noise barrier to the A14 would need to be retained as a result of residential development, the impact on the long term setting of Cambridge will be taken into account in determining the planning application. The potential to replace the barrier with higher quality design and materials will be explored and secured through any planning permission if appropriate, subject to ensuring no adverse noise impact on existing communities."</p> <p>2.2. "..... It will be particularly important to keep a balance between the provision of effective mitigation measures (such as noise barriers and / or buildings designed or oriented to screen noise) and the creation of an attractive urban edge alongside the widened road. The original strategy envisaged that commercial uses may be used for this purpose."</p> <p>2 &amp; 4. The Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the A14 Improvements scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvement to the A14 as set out at paragraph 2.5. of the SPD. Developers have contributed to the construction of the existing noise barrier, which was intended to be a temporary measure.</p> <p>3. The Council accepts that in the current market conditions there are different issues regarding viability than in recent previous years. However the SPD sets out the Council's aspirations irrespective of whether development is brought forward</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.5. is reworded to read:</p> <p>2.3. The Government's proposed A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement scheme had been identified as an opportunity to upgrade the noise barrier fence when it was being moved as part of the scheme, using developer contributions. However, the Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvements to the A14.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29052 - Orchard Park Community Council	<p><b>Object</b> This states that costs of potential replacement or design improvements to the barrier will be funded through developer applications in collaboration with the Highways Agency. However, it is clear that this funding may not be able to be secured or may not cover the costs, and unclear how any other necessary improvement will be funded.</p>	<p>immediately or at a later date when different market conditions may prevail.</p> <p>The Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the A14 Improvements scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvement to the A14 as set out at paragraph 2.5. of the SPD. The SPD needs updating to reflect the current position.</p>	<p>Delete paragraph 2.5. and replace it with the following paragraph:                  2.3. The Government's proposed A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement scheme had been identified as an opportunity to upgrade the noise barrier fence when it was being moved as part of the scheme, using developer contributions. However, the Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvements to the A14.</p>
29013 - Cambridge City Council	<p><b>Object</b> The paragraph states that costs of potential replacement or design improvements to the barrier will be secured through developer applications. However, it is inaccurate to suggest the funding to widen the A14 can be relied on as potential funding via planning applications. Other options need to be explored for funding improvements.</p>	<p>The Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the A14 Improvements scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvement to the A14 as set out at paragraph 2.5. of the SPD. The SPD needs updating to reflect the current position.</p>	<p>Delete paragraph 2.5. and replace it with the following paragraph:                  2.3. The Government's proposed A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement scheme had been identified as an opportunity to upgrade the noise barrier fence when it was being moved as part of the scheme, using developer contributions. However, the Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvements to the A14.</p>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>2.13</i>				
29118 - Gallagher Estates	Comment	The planning permission for the Travelodge hotel on COM3 granted in October 2010 should be referenced.	This is an update since the Draft SPD was published and requires adding to the document.	Amend the original paragraph 2.13 to read: 2.8. An application for commercial B1 uses of 4,180sqm was granted consent by planning committee in November 2009 on COM2b and COM3, reference S/0621/08/RM. Subsequently an application for an hotel was granted permission for COM3 on 29th September 2010, reference S/0428/10/F, for which work commenced on site in late 2010.

---

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

***3. Vision and Objectives for the SPD***

*Vision*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29053 - Orchard Park Community Council	Comment	The vision also makes reference to other guidance such as the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007 but it is not made clear how the SPD fits in with such other guidance. The vision should be strengthened and be clear how a high quality development will be created that will lead to a cohesive, integrated sustainable community with a high quality of life for residents.	The Vision for Orchard Park was set in the Arbury Camp Design Guide; this SPD does not aim to change that vision. This should be clarified, with any expansion of the text utilising text from the Arbury Camp Design Guide, with a focus on quality of life and living.	<p>Amend Section 3 to read: Vision</p> <p>3.1. The overall vision for Orchard Park was set out in the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007, which established the structure of Orchard Park, together with establishing the character areas and the design parameters for buildings, public realm and open spaces. The vision for this SPD relates specifically to the design and appearance of the remaining vacant land parcels at Orchard Park, excluding Land Parcels G and H1, to address the changes in the context of further development since 2007, within the established masterplanned structure and hierarchy of sites at Orchard Park and the objective of achieving a sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.</p> <p>3.2. The vision is for the remaining developments to contribute to making Orchard Park an attractive, vibrant and contemporary new neighbourhood for Cambridge. New development should take its inspiration from the "unique Cambridge context, by linking high quality public open spaces and buildings that are formal, with fine grain and domestic scale streets" (Arbury Camp Design Guide, 2007), in order to create opportunities for a high quality of life and living for site users.</p> <p>3.3. New development should reinforce the distinct character areas established by the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007, see Figure 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The vision for Arbury Park is for a cluster of uses, with integrated facilities and amenities, designed holistically and incorporating high quality accessible open spaces and providing a 'gateway'.</li> <li>- The vision for the Circus, is the active heart of Orchard Park, centred on the avenue linking Kings Hedges Road to Unwin Square via the Circus, with mixed-use development around Unwin Square. The formality of this route should direct the design of development along its length.</li> <li>- The Square is a predominantly residential area.</li> <li>- The Hedges character area comprises residential, commercial and mixed-use, oriented around open spaces. Residential development is designed around the streets and mews pattern,</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>with a clear distinction between public and private space.</p> <p>3.4. Of key importance is the creation of a place that is safe, accessible and easy to move around. The development of pedestrian and cycle connections into and through developments will encourage walking and cycling in support of a healthy lifestyle, will increase opportunities for connectivity with neighbouring developments to increase social cohesion in support of the development of the wider Orchard Park community.</p> <p>3.5. Embedded within the design approach for all developments, from initial concepts through to the detailed design, should be measures to address the range of environmental sustainability issues and to address climate change to ensure the development remains viable throughout its lifetime. The strategy for sustainable development for Orchard Park includes the use of mixed-use walkable neighbourhoods, supported by appropriate and efficient residential densities, energy efficient site layout and the impact of building orientation in relation to microclimate, and access to green infrastructure. The Developer's Sustainability Action Plan, submitted in support of the original outline planning application, provides guidance on building design and the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM environmental certification schemes, renewable energy and waste. "Developers are encouraged to promote these environmental measures and exploit their market potential and value to respond to the rising demand for sustainable residential and commercial buildings. Further advice regarding the delivery of a sustainable biodiversity and ecology can be found in the Biodiversity and Ecology Management Plan." (Arbury Camp Design Guide, 2007). General direction on sustainability and climate change can be found in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, and Planning and Climate Change - Supplement to PPS1; the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development control Policies</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Development Plan Documents and District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
			<p>Objectives 3.6. The primary objective for the development of Orchard Park as a whole, as set out in the policy for the new neighbourhood, is to provide a high quality sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.</p>
			<p>3.7. New developments should reinforce the character area for Orchard Park in which it is located:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- for Arbury Park, development should be located within high quality accessible open spaces, provide an appropriate 'gateway' to Cambridge and Orchard Park and should integrate with existing developments;</li> <li>- for the Circus, development should encompass the active heart of the new community and reflect the formality of the avenue route from Kings Hedges Road to Unwin Square via the Circus, terminating in the civic space of Unwin Square;</li> <li>- the Square character area influences only Plot COM3 and it is envisaged that the hotel under construction there, will be successfully completed; and</li> <li>- for the Hedges character area, development should comprise a mix of uses oriented around open spaces; with residential development embracing the streets and mews form.</li> </ul>
			<p>3.8. Additionally all developments should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- embed within their design proposals the principles of sustainable design and construction and to address climate change and in so doing maximise the standards of sustainability achieved;</li> <li>- from the outset, through careful site planning and the design of individual buildings, incorporate preventative measures to create a safe and hospitable environment for the site occupants in relation to the issues of noise and air quality emanating from traffic associated with the A14;</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- allow for the adequate provision of high quality amenity space to serve the needs of the development, designed in a manner to reinforce the quality of public open space and play areas already established;</li> <li>- complete and complement the townscape of Orchard Park;</li> <li>- create strong positive closure to views along streets;</li> <li>- provide strong containment of public realm areas;</li> <li>- provide natural surveillance of all adjacent public realm areas;</li> <li>- provide a clear delineation between public and private space;</li> <li>- ensure private space is secure from unwanted access from public areas.</li> </ul> <p>3.9. Developments alongside the A14 should, through careful site planning, screen the unsightly embankment for the benefit of both individual sites and the existing developments.</p>

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

3.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29014 - Cambridge City Council	Comment	The City Council considers that the vision for the SPD could be stronger. The SPD sets out the need to create an attractive, vibrant and contemporary new neighbourhood for Cambridge, with development taking its inspiration from the unique context, open spaces and buildings. As well as this the City Council considers that it is important to ensure that the vision for the site includes the creation of a high quality of life and living environment for residents.	The Vision for Orchard Park was set in the Arbury Camp Design Guide; this SPD does not aim to change that vision. This should be clarified, with any expansion of the text utilising text from the Arbury Camp Design Guide, with a focus on quality of life and living.	<p>Amend Section 3 to read: Vision</p> <p>3.1. The overall vision for Orchard Park was set out in the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007, which established the structure of Orchard Park, together with establishing the character areas and the design parameters for buildings, public realm and open spaces. The vision for this SPD relates specifically to the design and appearance of the remaining vacant land parcels at Orchard Park, excluding Land Parcels E3, E4, G and H1, to address the changes in the context of further development since 2007, within the established masterplanned structure and hierarchy of sites at Orchard Park and the objective of achieving a sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.</p> <p>3.2. The vision is for the remaining developments to contribute to making Orchard Park an attractive, vibrant and contemporary new neighbourhood for Cambridge. New development should take its inspiration from the "unique Cambridge context, by linking high quality public open spaces and buildings that are formal, with fine grain and domestic scale streets" (Arbury Camp Design Guide, 2007), in order to create opportunities for a high quality of life and living for site users.</p> <p>3.3. New development should reinforce the distinct character areas established by the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007, see Figure 2.</p> <p>* The vision for Arbury Park is for a cluster of uses, with integrated facilities and amenities, designed holistically and incorporating high quality accessible open spaces and providing a 'gateway'.</p> <p>* The vision for the Circus, is the active heart of Orchard Park, centred on the avenue linking Kings Hedges Road to Unwin Square via the Circus, with mixed-use development around Unwin Square. The formality of this route should direct the design of development along its length.</p> <p>* The Square is a predominantly residential area.</p> <p>* The Hedges character area comprises residential, commercial and mixed-use, oriented around open spaces. Residential development is designed around the streets and mews pattern,</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>with a clear distinction between public and private space.</p> <p>3.4. Of key importance is the creation of a place that is safe, accessible and easy to move around. The development of pedestrian and cycle connections into and through developments will encourage walking and cycling in support of a healthy lifestyle, will increase opportunities for connectivity with neighbouring developments to increase social cohesion in support of the development of the wider Orchard Park community.</p> <p>3.5. Embedded within the design approach for all developments, from initial concepts through to the detailed design, should be measures to address the range of environmental sustainability issues and to address climate change to ensure the development remains viable throughout its lifetime. The strategy for sustainable development for Orchard Park includes the use of mixed-use walkable neighbourhoods, supported by appropriate and efficient residential densities, energy efficient site layout and the impact of building orientation in relation to microclimate, and access to green infrastructure. The Developer's Sustainability Action Plan, submitted in support of the original outline planning application, provides guidance on building design and the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM environmental certification schemes, renewable energy and waste. "Developers are encouraged to promote these environmental measures and exploit their market potential and value to respond to the rising demand for sustainable residential and commercial buildings. Further advice regarding the delivery of a sustainable biodiversity and ecology can be found in the Biodiversity and Ecology Management Plan." (Arbury Camp Design Guide, 2007). General direction on sustainability and climate change can be found in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, and Planning and Climate Change - Supplement to PPS1; the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development control Policies</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Development Plan Documents and District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
			<p>Objectives 3.6. The primary objective for the development of Orchard Park as a whole, as set out in the policy for the new neighbourhood, is to provide a high quality sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.</p>
			<p>3.7. New developments should reinforce the character area for Orchard Park in which it is located:  * for Arbury Park, development should be located within high quality accessible open spaces, provide an appropriate 'gateway' to Cambridge and Orchard Park and should integrate with existing developments;  * for the Circus, development should encompass the active heart of the new community and reflect the formality of the avenue route from Kings Hedges Road to Unwin Square via the Circus, terminating in the civic space of Unwin Square;  * the Square character area influences only Plot COM3 and it is envisaged that the hotel under construction there, will be successfully completed;  and  * for the Hedges character area, development should comprise a mix of uses oriented around open spaces; with residential development embracing the streets and mews form.</p>
			<p>3.8. Additionally all developments should:  <input type="checkbox"/>  * embed within their design proposals the principles of sustainable design and construction and to address climate change and in so doing maximise the standards of sustainability achieved;  * from the outset, through careful site planning and the design of individual buildings, incorporate preventative measures to create a safe and hospitable environment for the site occupants in relation to the issues of noise and air quality emanating from traffic associated with the A14;</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* allow for the adequate provision of high quality amenity space to serve the needs of the development, designed in a manner to reinforce the quality of public open space and play areas already established;</li> <li>* complete and complement the townscape of Orchard Park;</li> <li>* create strong positive closure to views along streets;</li> <li>* provide strong containment of public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide natural surveillance of all adjacent public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide a clear delineation between public and private space;</li> </ul> <p>ensure private space is secure from unwanted access from public areas.</p> <p>3.9. Developments alongside the A14 should, through careful site planning, screen the unsightly embankment for the benefit of both individual sites and the existing developments.</p>
3.3				
29016 - Cambridge City Council	Comment	The vision also makes reference to other guidance such as the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007. The City Council is unsure as to how the Orchard Park Design Guidance SPD fits in with this and other documents?	The Vision for Orchard Park was set in the Arbury Camp Design Guide; this SPD does not aim to change that vision. This should be clarified, with any expansion of the text utilising text from the Arbury Camp Design Guide, with a focus on quality of life and living.	Amend paragraph 3.1. to read: 3.1. The overall vision for Orchard Park was set out in the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007, which established the structure of Orchard Park, together with establishing the character areas and the design parameters for buildings, public realm and open spaces. The vision for this SPD relates specifically to the design and appearance of the remaining vacant land parcels at Orchard Park, excluding Land Parcels E3, E4, G and H1, to address the changes in the context of further development since 2007, within the established masterplanned structure and hierarchy of sites at Orchard Park and the objective of achieving a sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

3.4

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29015 - Cambridge City Council	Comment	<p>The principles of sustainable development and buildings designed for climate change adaptation should be embedded into the design guidance from the very start, and as such the draft Design Guide should be amended to take full account of its importance. Such an approach would be in keeping with the requirements of PPS1 Supplement (Planning and Climate Change).</p> <p>The vision should include the need to provide sufficient additional green and open spaces in the development to aid the creation of place.</p>	<p>Sustainability is addressed in the Arbury Camp Design Guide vision; more of this can be quoted in the SPD and legislation changes subsequent to the publication of the Design Guide addressed.</p> <p>The primary structural public spaces and play areas for Orchard Park have been identified in the Orchard Park masterplan. Further development will be required to provide it's own on-site requirements in accordance with the Arbury Camp Design Guide, the Council's policies and District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire.</p>	<p>Amend the text to read:</p> <p>3.5. Embedded within the design approach for all developments, from initial concepts through to the detailed design, should be measures to address the range of environmental sustainability issues and to address climate change to ensure the development remains viable throughout its lifetime. The strategy for sustainable development for Orchard Park includes the use of mixed-use walkable neighbourhoods, supported by appropriate and efficient residential densities, energy efficient site layout and the impact of building orientation in relation to microclimate, and access to green infrastructure. The Developer's Sustainability Action Plan, submitted in support of the original outline planning application, provides guidance on building design and the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM environmental certification schemes, renewable energy and waste. "Developers are encouraged to promote these environmental measures and exploit their market potential and value to respond to the rising demand for sustainable residential and commercial buildings. Further advice regarding the delivery of a sustainable biodiversity and ecology can be found in the Biodiversity and Ecology Management Plan." (Arbury Camp Design Guide, 2007). General direction on sustainability and climate change can be found in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, and Planning and Climate Change - Supplement to PPS1; the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development control Policies Development Plan Documents and District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>3.8. Additionally all developments should:  * embed within their design proposals the principles of sustainable design and construction and to address climate change and in so doing maximise the standards of sustainability achieved;  * from the outset, through careful site planning and the design of individual buildings, incorporate preventative measures to create a safe and</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>hospitable environment for the site occupants in relation to the issues of noise and air quality emanating from traffic associated with the A14;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* allow for the adequate provision of high quality amenity space to serve the needs of the development, designed in a manner to reinforce the quality of public open space and play areas already established;</li> <li>* complete and complement the townscape of Orchard Park;</li> <li>* create strong positive closure to views along streets;</li> <li>* provide strong containment of public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide natural surveillance of all adjacent public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide a clear delineation between public and private space;</li> <li>* ensure private space is secure from unwanted access from public areas.</li> </ul>
			<p>Amend paragraph 5.26. to read:</p> <p>5.26. The public spaces and play areas for the original 900 dwellings at Orchard Park have already been constructed. Additional open space and play areas are required for development associated with the additional 220 residential units permitted under Policy SP/1. All landscape design schemes should include appropriate planting to provide an attractive setting to the buildings, enhance facades and to define the edges of the public realm and public open spaces they abut. All landscape design, both hard and soft, should respect its location and integrate with its surroundings, be they existing or proposed to ensure that the interface between sites and uses is handled carefully and sensitively.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29054 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	Design for the effects of climate change and sustainable development should be included as a fundamental part of the guidance taking account of the need for mitigation and adaptation. There is no mention of the importance of green spaces and play areas.	<p>Sustainability is addressed in the Arbury Camp Design Guide vision; more of this can be quoted in the SPD and legislation changes subsequent to the publication of the Design Guide addressed.</p> <p>The primary structural public spaces and play areas for Orchard Park have been identified in the Orchard Park masterplan. Further development will be required to provide it's own on-site requirements in accordance with the Arbury Camp Design Guide, the Council's policies and District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire.</p>	<p>Amend the text to read:</p> <p>3.5. Embedded within the design approach for all developments, from initial concepts through to the detailed design, should be measures to address the range of environmental sustainability issues and to address climate change to ensure the development remains viable throughout its lifetime. The strategy for sustainable development for Orchard Park includes the use of mixed-use walkable neighbourhoods, supported by appropriate and efficient residential densities, energy efficient site layout and the impact of building orientation in relation to microclimate, and access to green infrastructure. The Developer's Sustainability Action Plan, submitted in support of the original outline planning application, provides guidance on building design and the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM environmental certification schemes, renewable energy and waste. "Developers are encouraged to promote these environmental measures and exploit their market potential and value to respond to the rising demand for sustainable residential and commercial buildings. Further advice regarding the delivery of a sustainable biodiversity and ecology can be found in the Biodiversity and Ecology Management Plan." (Arbury Camp Design Guide, 2007). General direction on sustainability and climate change can be found in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, and Planning and Climate Change - Supplement to PPS1; the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development control Policies Development Plan Documents and District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>3.8. Additionally all developments should:  * embed within their design proposals the principles of sustainable design and construction and to address climate change and in so doing maximise the standards of sustainability achieved;  * from the outset, through careful site planning and the design of individual buildings, incorporate</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>preventative measures to create a safe and hospitable environment for the site occupants in relation to the issues of noise and air quality emanating from traffic associated with the A14;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* allow for the adequate provision of high quality amenity space to serve the needs of the development, designed in a manner to reinforce the quality of public open space and play areas already established;</li> <li>* complete and complement the townscape of Orchard Park;</li> <li>* create strong positive closure to views along streets;</li> <li>* provide strong containment of public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide natural surveillance of all adjacent public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide a clear delineation between public and private space;</li> <li>* ensure private space is secure from unwanted access from public areas.</li> </ul>
			<p>Amend paragraph 5.26. to read:</p> <p>5.26. The public spaces and play areas for the original 900 dwellings at Orchard Park have already been constructed. Additional open space and play areas are required for development associated with the additional 220 residential units permitted under Policy SP/1. All landscape design schemes should include appropriate planting to provide an attractive setting to the buildings, enhance facades and to define the edges of the public realm and public open spaces they abut. All landscape design, both hard and soft, should respect its location and integrate with its surroundings, be they existing or proposed to ensure that the interface between sites and uses is handled carefully and sensitively.</p>

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

*Objectives*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29055 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	It is not clear enough how the objectives will be achieved or what different land uses will add to the community and to community cohesion. The objective of a "sustainable housing led development" should be embedded in the core values in the document. Where possible the design guidance should seek to encourage developers to achieve sustainable development which exceeds the minimum Code for Sustainable Homes / BREAAAM standards. Noise and air quality implications of the development should be given more significance in the guidance and be a fundamental part of the design process.	<p>It is for the developer to embrace and deliver the objectives of the Arbury Camp Design Guide and the SPD in the preparation of development proposals.</p> <p>The Council's policies have identified land uses that may be located at Orchard Park, each of which, or other uses that may be proposed, will make a different contribution to Orchard Park and will be assessed on their appropriateness for their proposed location at the time of considering any application or pre-application discussions. The Orchard Park Design Guide sets out the overall masterplanning relationships between plots and the SPD does not seek to amend this. This could be clarified.</p> <p>Greater emphasis can be made of the objective for sustainable housing led development.</p> <p>Clarification can be made that the Council encourages developers to embrace the principles of sustainable development and exceed the statutory minimum standards required.</p> <p>Noise and air quality issues are of major importance to any development at Orchard Park. Consideration can be given to strengthening the wording of the text to strengthen this emphasis.</p>	<p>Amend Section 3 to read:</p> <p>3. VISION &amp; OBJECTIVES Vision</p> <p>3.1. The overall vision for Orchard Park was set out in the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007, which established the structure of Orchard Park, together with establishing the character areas and the design parameters for buildings, public realm and open spaces. The vision for this SPD relates specifically to the design and appearance of the remaining vacant land parcels at Orchard Park, excluding Land Parcels E3, E4, G and H1, to address the changes in the context of further development since 2007, within the established masterplanned structure and hierarchy of sites at Orchard Park and the objective of achieving a sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.</p> <p>3.2. The vision is for the remaining developments to contribute to making Orchard Park an attractive, vibrant and contemporary new neighbourhood for Cambridge. New development should take its inspiration from the "unique Cambridge context, by linking high quality public open spaces and buildings that are formal, with fine grain and domestic scale streets" (Arbury Camp Design Guide, 2007), in order to create opportunities for a high quality of life and living for site users.</p> <p>3.3. New development should reinforce the distinct character areas established by the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007, see Figure 2.</p> <p>* The vision for Arbury Park is for a cluster of uses, with integrated facilities and amenities, designed holistically and incorporating high quality accessible open spaces and providing a 'gateway'.</p> <p>* The vision for the Circus, is the active heart of Orchard Park, centred on the avenue linking Kings Hedges Road to Unwin Square via the Circus, with mixed-use development around Unwin Square. The formality of this route should direct the design of development along its length.</p> <p>* The Square is a predominantly residential area.</p> <p>* The Hedges character area comprises residential, commercial and mixed-use, oriented</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>around open spaces. Residential development is designed around the streets and mews pattern, with a clear distinction between public and private space.</p> <p>3.4. Of key importance is the creation of a place that is safe, accessible and easy to move around. The development of pedestrian and cycle connections into and through developments will encourage walking and cycling in support of a healthy lifestyle, will increase opportunities for connectivity with neighbouring developments to increase social cohesion in support of the development of the wider Orchard Park community.</p> <p>3.5. Embedded within the design approach for all developments, from initial concepts through to the detailed design, should be measures to address the range of environmental sustainability issues and to address climate change to ensure the development remains viable throughout its lifetime. The strategy for sustainable development for Orchard Park includes the use of mixed-use walkable neighbourhoods, supported by appropriate and efficient residential densities, energy efficient site layout and the impact of building orientation in relation to microclimate, and access to green infrastructure. The Developer's Sustainability Action Plan, submitted in support of the original outline planning application, provides guidance on building design and the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM environmental certification schemes, renewable energy and waste. "Developers are encouraged to promote these environmental measures and exploit their market potential and value to respond to the rising demand for sustainable residential and commercial buildings. Further advice regarding the delivery of a sustainable biodiversity and ecology can be found in the Biodiversity and Ecology Management Plan." (Arbury Camp Design Guide, 2007). General direction on sustainability and climate change can be found in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, and Planning and Climate Change - Supplement to PPS1; the Local Development Framework Core</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Strategy and Development control Policies Development Plan Documents and District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Objectives</p> <p>3.6. The primary objective for the development of Orchard Park as a whole, as set out in the policy for the new neighbourhood, is to provide a high quality sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.</p> <p>3.7. New developments should reinforce the character area for Orchard Park in which it is located:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* for Arbury Park, development should be located within high quality accessible open spaces, provide an appropriate 'gateway' to Cambridge and Orchard Park and should integrate with existing developments;</li> <li>* for the Circus, development should encompass the active heart of the new community and reflect the formality of the avenue route from Kings Hedges Road to Unwin Square via the Circus, terminating in the civic space of Unwin Square;</li> <li>* the Square character area influences only Plot COM3 and it is envisaged that the hotel under construction there, will be successfully completed; and</li> <li>* for the Hedges character area, development should comprise a mix of uses oriented around open spaces; with residential development embracing the streets and mews form.</li> </ul> <p>3.8. Additionally all developments should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* embed within their design proposals the principles of sustainable design and construction and to address climate change and in so doing maximise the standards of sustainability achieved;</li> <li>* from the outset, through careful site planning and the design of individual buildings, incorporate preventative measures to create a safe and hospitable environment for the site occupants in relation to the issues of noise and air quality emanating from traffic associated with the A14;</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* allow for the adequate provision of high quality amenity space to serve the needs of the development, designed in a manner to reinforce the quality of public open space and play areas already established;</li> <li>* complete and complement the townscape of Orchard Park;</li> <li>* create strong positive closure to views along streets;</li> <li>* provide strong containment of public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide natural surveillance of all adjacent public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide a clear delineation between public and private space;</li> <li>* ensure private space is secure from unwanted access from public areas.</li> </ul> <p>3.9. Developments alongside the A14 should, through careful site planning, screen the unsightly embankment for the benefit of both individual sites and the existing developments.</p>

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

3.5

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29017 - Cambridge City Council	Comment	The City Council does not consider that the current SPD sets ambitious enough standards for sustainable design and construction. The standards do not match the same ambitions for Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM, when compared to the other growth sites. It is considered that the SPD should seek to deliver sustainable development that seeks to go beyond the minimum standards set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes where possible. The principles of sustainable development should be at the heart of the objectives for Orchard Park.	<p>Greater emphasis can be made of the objective for sustainable housing led development.</p> <p>Clarification can be made that the Council encourages developers to embrace the principles of sustainable development and maximize the sustainability standards of their developments.</p>	<p>Increase the emphasis on the vision and objective for sustainable housing led development.</p> <p>3.5. Embedded within the design approach for all developments, from initial concepts through to the detailed design, should be measures to address the range of environmental sustainability issues and to address climate change to ensure the development remains viable throughout its lifetime. The strategy for sustainable development for Orchard Park includes the use of mixed-use walkable neighbourhoods, supported by appropriate and efficient residential densities, energy efficient site layout and the impact of building orientation in relation to microclimate, and access to green infrastructure. The Developer's Sustainability Action Plan, submitted in support of the original outline planning application, provides guidance on building design and the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM environmental certification schemes, renewable energy and waste. "Developers are encouraged to promote these environmental measures and exploit their market potential and value to respond to the rising demand for sustainable residential and commercial buildings. Further advice regarding the delivery of a sustainable biodiversity and ecology can be found in the Biodiversity and Ecology Management Plan." (Arbury Camp Design Guide, 2007). General direction on sustainability and climate change can be found in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, and Planning and Climate Change - Supplement to PPS1; the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development control Policies Development Plan Documents and District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>3.6. The primary objective for the development of Orchard Park as a whole, as set out in the policy for the new neighbourhood, is to provide a high quality sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>3.8. Additionally all developments should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* embed within their design proposals the principles of sustainable design and construction and to address climate change and in so doing maximise the standards of sustainability achieved;</li> <li>* from the outset, through careful site planning and the design of individual buildings, incorporate preventative measures to create a safe and hospitable environment for the site occupants in relation to the issues of noise and air quality emanating from traffic associated with the A14;</li> <li>* allow for the adequate provision of high quality amenity space to serve the needs of the development, designed in a manner to reinforce the quality of public open space and play areas already established;</li> <li>* complete and complement the townscape of Orchard Park;</li> <li>* create strong positive closure to views along streets;</li> <li>* provide strong containment of public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide natural surveillance of all adjacent public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide a clear delineation between public and private space;</li> <li>* ensure private space is secure from unwanted access from public areas.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29019 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The objectives section could be stronger and should set out precisely how the vision for the site will be achieved. The objectives should also set out how land uses on the sites will give Orchard Park increased identity and add to the strength of the existing community. Localism and involvement of the existing community should be promoted as an objective of the SPD in how the vision will be achieved.	<p>It is for the developer to embrace and deliver the objectives of the Arbury Camp Design Guide and the SPD in the preparation of development proposals.</p> <p>The Council's policies have identified land uses that may be located at Orchard Park, each of which, or other uses that may be proposed, will make a different contribution to Orchard Park and will be assessed on their appropriateness for their proposed location at the time of considering any application or undertaking any pre-application discussions. The SPD has been clarified that the Orchard Park Design Guide sets out the overall masterplanning relationships between plots and the SPD does not seek to amend this.</p> <p>The Council is considering corporately how to embrace the Coalition Government's localism agenda, which will emerge and develop over time and will influence how we engage with the community on planning matters. However, the Council considers that its partnership approach to Orchard Park with key stakeholders over a number of years is consistent with the spirit of localism and this has been reflected in the way that the SPD has been prepared and consulted on, including with the Orchard Park Community Council, local residents and landowners. The Council intends to continue to work in partnership in relation to development proposals for the remaining land parcels that will be brought forward by developers.</p>	<p>Amend the original paragraph 3.5 to read: Objectives</p> <p>3.6. The primary objective for the development of Orchard Park as a whole, as set out in the policy for the new neighbourhood, is to provide a high quality sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.</p> <p>3.7. New developments should reinforce the character area for Orchard Park in which it is located: * for Arbury Park, development should be located within high quality accessible open spaces, provide an appropriate 'gateway' to Cambridge and Orchard Park and should integrate with existing developments; * for the Circus, development should encompass the active heart of the new community and reflect the formality of the avenue route from Kings Hedges Road to Unwin Square via the Circus, terminating in the civic space of Unwin Square; * the Square character area influences only Plot COM3 and it is envisaged that the hotel under construction there, will be successfully completed; and * for the Hedges character area, development should comprise a mix of uses oriented around open spaces; with residential development embracing the streets and mews form.</p> <p>3.8. Additionally all developments should: * embed within their design proposals the principles of sustainable design and construction and to address climate change and in so doing maximise the standards of sustainability achieved; * from the outset, through careful site planning and the design of individual buildings, incorporate preventative measures to create a safe and hospitable environment for the site occupants in relation to the issues of noise and air quality emanating from traffic associated with the A14; * allow for the adequate provision of high quality amenity space to serve the needs of the development, designed in a manner to reinforce the quality of public open space and play areas already established;</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* complete and complement the townscape of Orchard Park;</li> <li>* create strong positive closure to views along streets;</li> <li>* provide strong containment of public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide natural surveillance of all adjacent public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide a clear delineation between public and private space;</li> <li>* ensure private space is secure from unwanted access from public areas.</li> </ul>
			<p>3.9. Developments alongside the A14 should, through careful site planning, screen the unsightly embankment for the benefit of both individual sites and the existing developments.</p>
			<p>In Section 1 add a new paragraph to read: Working in Partnership 1.13. The preparation of the Orchard Park Design Guidance SPD has been undertaken in consultation with the Council's primary partners, the Orchard Park Community Council, who formally took on local parish responsibilities for the new community on 1st April 2009, the land owners, Gallagher Estates, Unex Holdings Limited and Cambridge City Council and with local residents. The Council intends to continue to work with its partners, generally and specifically, to facilitate the completion of the development at Orchard Park. South Cambridgeshire District Council urges developers to fully embrace the partnership approach and engage with the Council, and the Orchard Park community through the Orchard Park Community Council, from the outset of formulating development proposals.</p>

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

3.6

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29018 - Cambridge City Council	Object	<p>The SPD fails to give consideration to climate change adaptation in ensuring good design and sustainable development. The City Council considers it vital that consideration is given to the climate the development is likely to experience over its lifetime, taking account of landform, layout, orientation, massing, landscape to minimise energy consumption and help development adapt to the future climate changes. Sustainable development should be at the heart of the Design Guide, with climate change adaptation measures being relevant to many aspects of the document including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Built form;</li> <li>* Landscape, open space, public realm;</li> <li>* Block principles;</li> <li>* Water (SUDs).</li> </ul>	<p>Clarification can be made that the Council encourages developers to embrace the principles of sustainable development and climate change adaptation and maximise the standards of sustainability of their developments.</p> <p>Developers are encouraged to undertake sustainable approach to drainage, guidance on which is set out in the Council's District Design Guide: High Quality Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire. The land beneath Orchard Park experiences a high water table. Resultantly, a drainage strategy was devised for Orchard Park, with holding tanks constructed to reduce the discharge rate from the area into the river system. The high water table and the existence of a drainage infrastructure will impact on drainage considerations for the remaining land parcels at Orchard Park.</p>	<p>Amend paragraphs in Section 3 to read: Vision</p> <p>3.1. The overall vision for Orchard Park was set out in the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007, which established the structure of Orchard Park, together with establishing the character areas and the design parameters for buildings, public realm and open spaces. The vision for this SPD relates specifically to the design and appearance of the remaining vacant land parcels at Orchard Park, excluding Land Parcels E3, E4, G and H1, to address the changes in the context of further development since 2007, within the established masterplanned structure and hierarchy of sites at Orchard Park and the objective of achieving a sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.</p> <p>3.4. Of key importance is the creation of a place that is safe, accessible and easy to move around. The development of pedestrian and cycle connections into and through developments will encourage walking and cycling in support of a healthy lifestyle, will increase opportunities for connectivity with neighbouring developments to increase social cohesion in support of the development of the wider Orchard Park community.</p> <p>3.5. Embedded within the design approach for all developments, from initial concepts through to the detailed design, should be measures to address the range of environmental sustainability issues and to address climate change to ensure the development remains viable throughout its lifetime. The strategy for sustainable development for Orchard Park includes the use of mixed-use walkable neighbourhoods, supported by appropriate and efficient residential densities, energy efficient site layout and the impact of building orientation in relation to microclimate, and access to green infrastructure. The Developer's Sustainability Action Plan, submitted in support of the original outline planning application, provides guidance on building design and the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM environmental certification schemes, renewable energy and</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>waste. "Developers are encouraged to promote these environmental measures and exploit their market potential and value to respond to the rising demand for sustainable residential and commercial buildings. Further advice regarding the delivery of a sustainable biodiversity and ecology can be found in the Biodiversity and Ecology Management Plan." (Arbury Camp Design Guide, 2007). General direction on sustainability and climate change can be found in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, and Planning and Climate Change - Supplement to PPS1; the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development control Policies Development Plan Documents and District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
			<p>Objectives 3.6. The primary objective for the development of Orchard Park as a whole, as set out in the policy for the new neighbourhood, is to provide a high quality sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.</p>
			<p>3.8. Additionally all developments should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* embed within their design proposals the principles of sustainable design and construction and to address climate change and in so doing maximise the standards of sustainability achieved;</li> <li>* from the outset, through careful site planning and the design of individual buildings, incorporate preventative measures to create a safe and hospitable environment for the site occupants in relation to the issues of noise and air quality emanating from traffic associated with the A14;</li> <li>* allow for the adequate provision of high quality amenity space to serve the needs of the development, designed in a manner to reinforce the quality of public open space and play areas already established;</li> <li>* complete and complement the townscape of Orchard Park;</li> <li>* create strong positive closure to views along</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>streets;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* provide strong containment of public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide natural surveillance of all adjacent public realm areas;</li> <li>* provide a clear delineation between public and private space;</li> </ul> <p>ensure private space is secure from unwanted access from public areas.</p> <p>Add anew paragraph to read: Drainage</p> <p>4.41. The land beneath Orchard Park experiences a high water table. Resultantly, a drainage strategy was devised for Orchard Park, with holding tanks constructed to reduce the discharge rate from the area into the river system. The high water table and the existence of a drainage infrastructure will impact on drainage considerations for the remaining land parcels at Orchard Park.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29020 - Cambridge City Council	Object	<p>The site has considerable noise and air quality impacts, officers do not feel that sufficient weight has been attached to these; this is a site where preventive measures should be linked into good design and considered fully at the outset. Reference should be made to Chapter 10, South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide SPD.</p> <p>The objectives of the SPD fail to make reference to the role of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs). These should be considered at an early stage of the design process in order to mitigate against flood risk and to assist with climate change adaptation, amenity and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Noise and air quality issues are of major importance to any development at Orchard Park. The Council agrees that habitable rooms in residential properties adjacent to the A14 should not be facing the A14; hence in Section 6 the SPD recommends single aspect development to ensure habitable rooms in any residential properties adjacent to the A14 do not have a northerly aspect.</p> <p>Developers are encouraged to undertake sustainable approach to drainage, guidance on which is set out in the Council's District Design Guide: High Quality Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire. The land beneath Orchard Park experiences a high water table. Resultantly, a drainage strategy was devised for Orchard Park, with holding tanks constructed to reduce the discharge rate from the area into the river system. The high water table and the existence of a drainage infrastructure will impact on drainage considerations for the remaining land parcels at Orchard Park.</p>	<p>Reword paragraphs 4.26. to 4.42 to read: Noise 4.27. The ambient noise environment of the Orchard Park vacant land parcels is dominated by traffic noise from the A14. Noise can have a significant effect on the environment and on the quality of life experienced by individuals and communities.</p> <p>4.28. Being located alongside the A14 embankment, Orchard Park has always been vulnerable to issues of noise disturbance, addressed during the course of the original outline planning approval, resulting in the erection of an acoustic barrier, originally intended as a temporary measure but which will remain in place for the foreseeable future following the indefinite postponement of the planned A14 improvements. The acoustic impact of traffic noise emanating from the A14 is therefore a major influence for development choices on sites and developers should plan for the worst-case scenario.</p> <p>4.29. The control of noise to an acceptable level is a key design issue, and a requirement of the original design brief is to address the exposure to noise levels, highlighting that it is essential that the detailed design of built form within the study area achieves a maximum 'screening' affect from traffic noise emanating from the A14.</p> <p>4.30. The SPD provides general advice about how acoustic challenges could be addressed but the quality of development should not be compromised in addressing issues of noise attenuation in response to any future acoustic studies. Each application for development will need to undertake further noise assessments and plan development based on the worst-case scenario. In particular the key issue for these land parcels will be addressing impact on worker or residential amenity and the health and wellbeing of future residents in terms of providing acceptable noise levels both internally and in any external amenity areas.</p> <p>4.31. Noise implications of the A14 for the study</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>land parcels should be assessed in accordance with the Noise Exposure Categories (NECs) for new residential dwellings in Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise. For non-residential uses British Standard 8233: 1999 'Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings Code of Practice' identifies specific internal noise level guidance that should be achieved within developments. The World Health Organisation "Guidelines for Community Noise" and "Night Noise Guidelines for Europe" should also be consulted.</p> <p>4.32. Acceptable internal noise levels shall be achieved whilst meeting background and purge ventilation requirements at all times. The opening of any glazing / windows shall not compromise acceptable internal noise levels. Of particular concern is noise in relation to any rooms facing the A14.</p> <p>4.33. Full consideration shall also be given to ensuring noise levels to external amenity spaces are also acceptable in accordance with the guidelines stated above.</p> <p>Air Quality</p> <p>4.35. Most of the proposed development land parcels at Orchard Park lie within the SCDC Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) as shown in Figure 16. The two main issues relating to air quality at this location are discussed in more detail below.</p> <p>4.36. SCDC has a duty to protect future residents from the health effects of poor air quality. Such development should only take place if air quality objectives are being met and are likely to be met in the future or if adequate mitigation can be implemented.</p> <p>4.37. With this in mind, if residential development is considered, appropriate mitigation measures</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>may need to be sought by the developer to protect residents from emissions emanating from the A14. In addition, given the closeness of the land parcel to the carriageway of the A14, prospective developers may reasonably be asked to carry out air quality monitoring for a duration of no less than 6 months, which will aid in the determination of appropriate detailed design and mitigation measures.</p> <p>4.38. Given the locations detailed within the design brief, aspect and orientation are unlikely to have a significant effect on air quality although certain layout designs will pose a greater risk in terms of air quality than others, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Open/amenity space close to the carriageway upon which residents could reasonably spend 1 hour or more;</li> <li>* Layouts that create courtyards or "canyons" where pollutants may settle rather than disperse.</li> </ul> <p>4.39. Any new development adjacent to or within the AQMA should not cause a worsening of the air quality conditions predicted in the original assessment for the Orchard Park development. It is expected and advised that the developer will have regard to low emissions development and enters into early discussion with SCDC to agree the terms of a Low Emissions Strategy and ensure that LDF Policy NE/16 (Emissions) is achieved.</p> <p>4.40. It is essential that if these locations are considered for residential development, early pre-application discussions take place in order that air quality assessments and consequently any monitoring, modelling and mitigation measures are discussed and agreed prior to the granting of planning consents. Development should only take place if air quality objectives are being met and are likely to be met in the future, or if adequate mitigation can be implemented.</p> <p>Add a new paragraph 5.15 to read:</p> <p>5.15. Careful attention should be paid to the orientation of habitable rooms in relation to the</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>noise and air quality issues pertaining to Orchard Park. Of particular concern are land parcels COM2a, COM2b/3, COM4 and L2, where no habitable rooms facing the A14 should be provided for any residential properties adjacent to the A14. Care should also be taken in the design of the built form to ensure air flows through all external areas to prevent pockets of poor air quality collecting.</p> <p>Reword paragraphs 5.49. to 5.54 to read:</p> <p>5.53. The control of noise and air quality should be the starting point for good design. Residential development is inappropriate where national standards on noise and air quality cannot be met.</p> <p>5.54. It would be beneficial for buildings on the northern land parcels to be designed and placed in such a way so that they act as a noise barrier reducing the impact of noise from the A14 on the rest of the site, even with the retention of the A14 acoustic barrier. Not only should building location act as a screen to reduce noise from the A14, but also provide adequate noise mitigation to the occupiers of any residential development that may be proposed for the edge of the site.</p> <p>5.55. Residential properties should be located a minimum distance of 25m from the edge of the A14 carriageway.</p> <p>5.56. Any forthcoming proposals will have to respond to future air and noise assessments resulting from proposed improvements to the A14 and set out the measures required to achieve satisfactory mitigation. The level of impact and required response is dependent on the land use proposed.</p> <p>5.57. Any proposed development should address, through building design and architectural detailing, acoustic attenuation. This provides a significant opportunity to develop imaginative architectural responses to the acoustic demands of the site. As part of any noise insulation scheme, good noise mitigation measures such as appropriate</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>configuration and layout of noise sensitive rooms should be designed into the overall development to avoid mechanical and whole house ventilation systems and acoustic glazing and ventilation schemes should be a last resort.</p> <p>5.58. It should be noted that The London Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy provides some useful advice on sound-conscious urban design and the following practical noise reduction issues / measures are viewed as relevant to the various plot options:</p> <p>* Façade continuity and 'quiet side' - Buildings can be designed not only to protect their occupants, but to screen other areas from noise. High-density development following traditional street blocks can reduce noise on the 'quiet side' by 10 to 20 dB(A).</p> <p>* Spaces between buildings - Although enclosed spaces can often be tranquil, tightly-enclosed spaces can also 'trap' sound, including from poorly designed, installed or maintained ventilation plant, waste facilities, vehicle manoeuvring, neighbours, or aircraft. The balance of advantage between contained and more open layouts will depend on the relative contributions of different noise sources. In noisy areas, acoustic absorbency within 'courtyard' areas should normally be maximised, especially from dense vegetation and soft ground. Rooftop planting may be useful on lower level roofs. In quieter spaces, sound reflection can help people sense where they are. Paving design should consider noise not just from road vehicles, but trolleys, and, particularly over or near bedrooms, footfall. 'Solar pergolas' with photovoltaic panels, could modify sound propagation.</p> <p>* Façade reflectivity - Multiple reflections between opposing, acoustically hard building surfaces increases noise levels. Façades at the wrong angle can reflect sound into quiet areas, as can curved and outward sloping buildings. Sound absorbing panels, deep acoustic profiling, 'absorptive banners' and other elements should be</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>considered. A wider choice of acoustically absorptive materials needs to be developed, ideally using recycled materials.</p> <p>* Noise and height - High buildings, with less shielding from other buildings, may receive noise from a wider area. Stepping-back of upper floors, canopies and other projections can offer screening. Acoustic balconies, with high imperforate parapets and absorptive linings to the soffit of any projection above, can reduce noise at a window by 5 dB. The predictive capabilities of noise models need to be improved.</p> <p>* Vehicle access and parking - Waste storage and collection should be located away and/or screened from noise sensitive uses. Car parking and service areas should be screened, enclosed, or buffered with less sensitive uses.</p> <p>* Enclosed car parks and bays should be designed to minimise sound reverberation and breakout. Lockable gates to residential courtyards at night can reduce disturbance from vehicles and on-street revellers, especially in mixed-use areas, while avoiding the sort of exclusion associated with the 24- hour gated enclave.</p> <p>* Features of soundscape interest - Many sounds may be positive or negative depending on context (e.g. active water, wind in trees or rushes, loose surfaces, gratings, reverberant spaces).</p> <p>* Balancing needs - Passive solar design, in which homes need to face roughly south, may make it difficult to create a 'quiet side'. Noise screening could increase shading. More linking of buildings to reduce noise propagation may mean accepting some change in local character, although visual monotony can be avoided by setbacks and many other design features. The balance between noise reduction and other needs should take account of potential changes in noise sources, and in competing needs, over the lifetime of the development. (Reference / Source: "Sounder City, The Mayor's</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Ambient Noise Strategy, Mayor of London, March 2004", downloadable from:  <a href="http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/noise/docs/noise_strategy_all.pdf">http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/noise/docs/noise_strategy_all.pdf</a>)</p>
			<p>5.59. Any replacement noise barrier alongside the A14 should provide greater visual interest for both those travelling past on the A14 and for those viewing it from within Orchard Park. In so doing the noise barrier should provide noise attenuation equal to or greater than the minimum standards required by the Highways Agency, for the protection of premises in Orchard Park. Care should be taken to ensure the design and the selection of materials do not result in an increase in reflective noise and thereby increase the level of nuisance for the villages of Histon and Impington.</p>
			<p>Add a new paragraph to read:            Drainage</p>
			<p>4.41. The land beneath Orchard Park experiences a high water table. Resultantly, a drainage strategy was devised for Orchard Park, with holding tanks constructed to reduce the discharge rate from the area into the river system. The high water table and the existence of a drainage infrastructure will impact on drainage considerations for the remaining land parcels at Orchard Park.</p>

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

**4. Context and Site Appraisal**

4.2

28998

Object

"...also positive aspects to any views from the A14 to the north."  
  
Given that the barrier is remaining in place why is this relevant?

The tops of taller buildings will be visible from the A14 above the top of the noise barrier. The relevance of this comment is to ensure developers treat the design of the northern elevation of buildings equally, to ensure that travelers on the A14 are presented with good quality building design. Clarify to prevent any confusion.

4.17. The restrictive depth of the northern boundary land parcels means that developments that offer active frontages to the streets and spaces to their south, will present their backs to the A14 to the north. Parts of the backs of these buildings will be visible from the A14, either over the noise barrier, or through the clear Perspex panels, therefore the backs of these buildings should be designed in a manner that presents a positive aspect to any views from the A14 to the north to contribute to the retention of an attractive urban edge to Cambridge, as required under Policy SP/1 of the Site Specific Policies DPD. The height of the noise barrier varies in relation to ground level of the sites therefore designs need to be considered on an individual site basis.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29021 - Cambridge City Council	Object	<p>The potential widening of the A14 if this occurs will require a permanent noise barrier to be provided. The City Council considers the key issue to be mitigation against noise levels whilst also allowing for good barrier design. The SPD should be seeking to achieve an active frontage to the south of Plot Com 4, as there is no point doing this to the north adjacent to the A14.</p>	<p>The Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the A14 Improvements scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvement to the A14 as set out at paragraph 2.5. of the SPD. The SPD needs updating to reflect the current position.</p> <p>The SPD text refers to the providing active frontages to the south and positive aspects to the north. It is not the intention of the SPD to require an active frontage to the north. Travelers on the A14, however, will see the upper portions of tall buildings, over the noise barrier and through the clear Perspex panels; therefore the SPD highlights the need to present a well-designed face towards the A14 that will form the built northern edge of Cambridge.</p>	<p>Delete paragraph 2.5. and replace it with the following paragraph:                  2.3. The Government's proposed A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement scheme had been identified as an opportunity to upgrade the noise barrier fence when it was being moved as part of the scheme, using developer contributions. However, the Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvements to the A14.</p> <p>Amend paragraphs 4.26 to 4.33 to read:                  Noise                  4.27. The ambient noise environment of the Orchard Park vacant land parcels is dominated by traffic noise from the A14. Noise can have a significant effect on the environment and on the quality of life experienced by individuals and communities.</p> <p>4.28. Being located alongside the A14 embankment, Orchard Park has always been vulnerable to issues of noise disturbance, addressed during the course of the original outline planning approval, resulting in the erection of an acoustic barrier, originally intended as a temporary measure but which will remain in place for the foreseeable future following the indefinite postponement of the planned A14 improvements. The acoustic impact of traffic noise emanating from the A14 is therefore a major influence for development choices on sites and developers should plan for the worst-case scenario.</p> <p>4.29. The control of noise to an acceptable level is a key design issue, and a requirement of the original design brief is to address the exposure to</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>noise levels, highlighting that it is essential that the detailed design of built form within the study area achieves a maximum 'screening' affect from traffic noise emanating from the A14.</p> <p>4.30. The SPD provides general advice about how acoustic challenges could be addressed but the quality of development should not be compromised in addressing issues of noise attenuation in response to any future acoustic studies. Each application for development will need to undertake further noise assessments and plan development based on the worst-case scenario. In particular the key issue for these land parcels will be addressing impact on worker or residential amenity and the health and wellbeing of future residents in terms of providing acceptable noise levels both internally and in any external amenity areas.</p> <p>4.31. Noise implications of the A14 for the study land parcels should be assessed in accordance with the Noise Exposure Categories (NECs) for new residential dwellings in Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise. For non-residential uses British Standard 8233: 1999 'Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings Code of Practice' identifies specific internal noise level guidance that should be achieved within developments. The World Health Organisation "Guidelines for Community Noise" and "Night Noise Guidelines for Europe" should also be consulted.</p> <p>4.32. Acceptable internal noise levels shall be achieved whilst meeting background and purge ventilation requirements at all times. The opening of any glazing / windows shall not compromise acceptable internal noise levels. Of particular concern is noise in relation to any rooms facing the A14.</p> <p>4.33. Full consideration shall also be given to ensuring noise levels to external amenity spaces are also acceptable in accordance with the guidelines stated above.</p>

**Representations**

**Nature Summary of Main Issue**

**Council's Assessment**

**Action**

Add a new paragraph 5.15 to read:  
5.15. Careful attention should be paid to the orientation of habitable rooms in relation to the noise and air quality issues pertaining to Orchard Park. Of particular concern are land parcels COM2a, COM2b/3, COM4 and L2, where no habitable rooms facing the A14 should be provided for any residential properties adjacent to the A14. Care should also be taken in the design of the built form to ensure air flows through all external areas to prevent pockets of poor air quality collecting.

Reword paragraphs 5.49. to 5.54 to read:  
5.53. The control of noise and air quality should be the starting point for good design. Residential development is inappropriate where national standards on noise and air quality cannot be met.

5.54. It would be beneficial for buildings on the northern land parcels to be designed and placed in such a way so that they act as a noise barrier reducing the impact of noise from the A14 on the rest of the site, even with the retention of the A14 acoustic barrier. Not only should building location act as a screen to reduce noise from the A14, but also provide adequate noise mitigation to the occupiers of any residential development that may be proposed for the edge of the site.

5.55. Residential properties should be located a minimum distance of 25m from the edge of the A14 carriageway.

5.56. Any forthcoming proposals will have to respond to future air and noise assessments resulting from proposed improvements to the A14 and set out the measures required to achieve satisfactory mitigation. The level of impact and required response is dependent on the land use proposed.

5.57. Any proposed development should address, through building design and architectural detailing, acoustic attenuation. This provides a significant

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>opportunity to develop imaginative architectural responses to the acoustic demands of the site. As part of any noise insulation scheme, good noise mitigation measures such as appropriate configuration and layout of noise sensitive rooms should be designed into the overall development to avoid mechanical and whole house ventilation systems and acoustic glazing and ventilation schemes should be a last resort.</p> <p>5.58. It should be noted that The London Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy provides some useful advice on sound-conscious urban design and the following practical noise reduction issues / measures are viewed as relevant to the various plot options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Façade continuity and 'quiet side' - Buildings can be designed not only to protect their occupants, but to screen other areas from noise. High-density development following traditional street blocks can reduce noise on the 'quiet side' by 10 to 20 dB(A).</li> <li>* Spaces between buildings - Although enclosed spaces can often be tranquil, tightly-enclosed spaces can also 'trap' sound, including from poorly designed, installed or maintained ventilation plant, waste facilities, vehicle manoeuvring, neighbours, or aircraft. The balance of advantage between contained and more open layouts will depend on the relative contributions of different noise sources. In noisy areas, acoustic absorbency within 'courtyard' areas should normally be maximised, especially from dense vegetation and soft ground. Rooftop planting may be useful on lower level roofs. In quieter spaces, sound reflection can help people sense where they are. Paving design should consider noise not just from road vehicles, but trolleys, and, particularly over or near bedrooms, footfall. 'Solar pergolas' with photovoltaic panels, could modify sound propagation.</li> <li>* Façade reflectivity - Multiple reflections between opposing, acoustically hard building surfaces increases noise levels. Façades at the wrong</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>angle can reflect sound into quiet areas, as can curved and outward sloping buildings. Sound absorbing panels, deep acoustic profiling, 'absorptive banners' and other elements should be considered. A wider choice of acoustically absorptive materials needs to be developed, ideally using recycled materials.</p> <p>* Noise and height - High buildings, with less shielding from other buildings, may receive noise from a wider area. Stepping-back of upper floors, canopies and other projections can offer screening. Acoustic balconies, with high imperforate parapets and absorptive linings to the soffit of any projection above, can reduce noise at a window by 5 dB. The predictive capabilities of noise models need to be improved.</p> <p>* Vehicle access and parking - Waste storage and collection should be located away and/or screened from noise sensitive uses. Car parking and service areas should be screened, enclosed, or buffered with less sensitive uses.</p> <p>* Enclosed car parks and bays should be designed to minimise sound reverberation and breakout. Lockable gates to residential courtyards at night can reduce disturbance from vehicles and on-street revellers, especially in mixed-use areas, while avoiding the sort of exclusion associated with the 24- hour gated enclave.</p> <p>* Features of soundscape interest - Many sounds may be positive or negative depending on context (e.g. active water, wind in trees or rushes, loose surfaces, gratings, reverberant spaces).</p> <p>* Balancing needs - Passive solar design, in which homes need to face roughly south, may make it difficult to create a 'quiet side'. Noise screening could increase shading. More linking of buildings to reduce noise propagation may mean accepting some change in local character, although visual monotony can be avoided by setbacks and many other design features. The balance between noise reduction and other needs should take account of</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>potential changes in noise sources, and in competing needs, over the lifetime of the development.            (Reference / Source: "Sounder City, The Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy, Mayor of London, March 2004", downloadable from: <a href="http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/noise/docs/noise_strategy_all.pdf">http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/noise/docs/noise_strategy_all.pdf</a>)</p> <p>5.59. Any replacement noise barrier alongside the A14 should provide greater visual interest for both those travelling past on the A14 and for those viewing it from within Orchard Park. In so doing the noise barrier should provide noise attenuation equal to or greater than the minimum standards required by the Highways Agency, for the protection of premises in Orchard Park. Care should be taken to ensure the design and the selection of materials do not result in an increase in reflective noise and thereby increase the level of nuisance for the villages of Histon and Impington.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.2. to read:            4.17. The restrictive depth of the northern boundary land parcels means that developments that offer active frontages to the streets and spaces to their south, will present their backs to the A14 to the north. Parts of the backs of these buildings will be visible from the A14, either over the noise barrier, or through the clear Perspex panels, therefore the backs of these buildings should be designed in a manner that presents a positive aspect to any views from the A14 to the north to contribute to the retention of an attractive urban edge to Cambridge, as required under Policy SP/1 of the Site Specific Policies DPD. The height of the noise barrier varies in relation to ground level of the sites therefore designs need to be considered on an individual site basis.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29056 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	Whether or not the widening of the A14 proceeds, there is a need for an effective noise barrier to protect new and current residents. The control of noise must be the starting point with good design also an important factor. It is not clear why there is a proposal for an active frontage to the north of COM4 as this is adjacent to the A14 and therefore less important than the southern frontage.	<p>The postponement of the A14 widening scheme will result in the existing A14 noise barrier remaining in place for the foreseeable future. Noise and air quality issues are of major importance to any development at Orchard Park. Consideration can be given to strengthening the wording of the text to strengthen this emphasis.</p> <p>The SPD text refers to the providing active frontages to the south and positive aspects to the north. It is not the intention of the SPD to require an active frontage to the north. Travelers on the A14, however, will see the upper portions of tall buildings, over the noise barrier and through the clear Perspex panels; therefore the SPD highlights the need to present a well-designed face towards the A14 that will form the built northern edge of Cambridge.</p>	<p>Reword paragraph 4.2 to read: 4.17. The restrictive depth of the northern boundary land parcels means that developments that offer active frontages to the streets and spaces to their south, will present their backs to the A14 to the north. Parts of the backs of these buildings will be visible from the A14, either over the noise barrier, or through the clear Perspex panels, therefore the backs of these buildings should be designed in a manner that presents a positive aspect to any views from the A14 to the north to contribute to the retention of an attractive urban edge to Cambridge, as required under Policy SP/1 of the Site Specific Policies DPD. The height of the noise barrier varies in relation to ground level of the sites therefore designs need to be considered on an individual site basis.</p> <p>Reword paragraphs 4.26. to 4.33 to read: Noise 4.27. The ambient noise environment of the Orchard Park vacant land parcels is dominated by traffic noise from the A14. Noise can have a significant effect on the environment and on the quality of life experienced by individuals and communities.</p> <p>4.28. Being located alongside the A14 embankment, Orchard Park has always been vulnerable to issues of noise disturbance, addressed during the course of the original outline planning approval, resulting in the erection of an acoustic barrier, originally intended as a temporary measure but which will remain in place for the foreseeable future following the indefinite postponement of the planned A14 improvements. The acoustic impact of traffic noise emanating from the A14 is therefore a major influence for development choices on sites and developers should plan for the worst-case scenario.</p> <p>4.29. The control of noise to an acceptable level is a key design issue, and a requirement of the original design brief is to address the exposure to noise levels, highlighting that it is essential that the detailed design of built form within the study area</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>achieves a maximum 'screening' affect from traffic noise emanating from the A14.</p> <p>4.30. The SPD provides general advice about how acoustic challenges could be addressed but the quality of development should not be compromised in addressing issues of noise attenuation in response to any future acoustic studies. Each application for development will need to undertake further noise assessments and plan development based on the worst-case scenario. In particular the key issue for these land parcels will be addressing impact on worker or residential amenity and the health and wellbeing of future residents in terms of providing acceptable noise levels both internally and in any external amenity areas.</p> <p>4.31. Noise implications of the A14 for the study land parcels should be assessed in accordance with the Noise Exposure Categories (NECs) for new residential dwellings in Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise. For non-residential uses British Standard 8233: 1999 'Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings Code of Practice' identifies specific internal noise level guidance that should be achieved within developments. The World Health Organisation "Guidelines for Community Noise" and "Night Noise Guidelines for Europe" should also be consulted.</p> <p>4.32. Acceptable internal noise levels shall be achieved whilst meeting background and purge ventilation requirements at all times. The opening of any glazing / windows shall not compromise acceptable internal noise levels. Of particular concern is noise in relation to any rooms facing the A14.</p> <p>4.33. Full consideration shall also be given to ensuring noise levels to external amenity spaces are also acceptable in accordance with the guidelines stated above.</p> <p>4.34. Any considerations for the replacement of the noise barrier should ensure that any reflective</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>noise is minimised to protect the villages of Histon and Impington to the north of the A14.</p> <p>Add a new paragraph before the original 5.49 to read:            5.53. The control of noise and air quality should be the starting point for good design. Residential development is inappropriate where national standards on noise and air quality cannot be met.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.2. to read:            4.17. The restrictive depth of the northern boundary land parcels means that developments that offer active frontages to the streets and spaces to their south, will present their backs to the A14 to the north. Parts of the backs of these buildings will be visible from the A14, either over the noise barrier, or through the clear Perspex panels, therefore the backs of these buildings should be designed in a manner that presents a positive aspect to any views from the A14 to the north to contribute to the retention of an attractive urban edge to Cambridge, as required under Policy SP/1 of the Site Specific Policies DPD. The height of the noise barrier varies in relation to ground level of the sites therefore designs need to be considered on an individual site basis.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4.8 29057 - Orchard Park Community Council	Comment	The guidance incorrectly states the all sites front onto Chieftain Way.	This identifies an error in the text that requires correcting.	Amend paragraph 4.8. to read: 4.9. The overall form of Orchard Park in accordance with the masterplan is of residential or mixed-use streets, squares and mews. The scale and massing of existing developments fronting the main streets and spaces, in terms of frontage treatment and building design follows the form and hierarchy set out in the Arbury Camp Design Guide. Many of the vacant land parcels front directly onto the existing road network, and the Arbury Camp Design Guide considers them a key opportunity to provide an active frontage and a positive streetscape to enclose the road and public realm network, and respond positively to the existing neighbouring residential developments.
29022 - Cambridge City Council	Comment	Not all of the sites being considered front onto Chieftain Way	This identifies an error in the text that requires correcting.	Amend paragraph 4.8. to read: 4.9. The overall form of Orchard Park in accordance with the masterplan is of residential or mixed-use streets, squares and mews. The scale and massing of existing developments fronting the main streets and spaces, in terms of frontage treatment and building design follows the form and hierarchy set out in the Arbury Camp Design Guide. Many of the vacant land parcels front directly onto the existing road network, and the Arbury Camp Design Guide considers them a key opportunity to provide an active frontage and a positive streetscape to enclose the road and public realm network, and respond positively to the existing neighbouring residential developments.

**Representations**

**Nature Summary of Main Issue**

**Council's Assessment**

**Action**

4.20

29023 - Cambridge City Council

Object

The SPD should set down key design principles for the potential new permanent noise barrier. For example, the noise barrier could be designed to be disguised by vegetation to both north and south elevations. The SPD should give consideration to more innovative barriers that are now available.

The paragraph states that costs of potential replacement or design improvements to the barrier will be secured through planning applications. However, it is inaccurate to suggest the funding to widen the A14 can be relied on as potential funding via planning applications. Other options need to be explored for funding improvements.

The Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvement to the A14.

Amend paragraph 4.20 to read:  
4.20. The A14 embankment and acoustic barrier acts as the backdrop to development on the land parcels along the northern edge of Orchard Park. The Government in its Comprehensive Spending Review in November 2010 withdrew the funding for the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvements scheme for the foreseeable future. The existing A14 noise barrier alongside Orchard Park will therefore remain in place for the foreseeable future. In the event that a scheme is brought forward for improvements to the A14, Policy SP/1 of the Site Specific Policies DPD establishes South Cambridgeshire District Council's requirements in relation to the appearance and functionality of any replacement noise barrier, or of any development. The impact of the long-term setting of Cambridge will be taken into account in determining planning applications.

Add an additional paragraph to read:  
4.34. Any considerations for the replacement of the noise barrier should ensure that any reflective noise is minimised to protect the villages of Histon and Impington to the north of the A14.

Add an additional paragraph to read:  
5.59. Any replacement noise barrier alongside the A14 should provide greater visual interest for both those travelling past on the A14 and for those viewing it from within Orchard Park. In so doing the noise barrier should provide noise attenuation equal to or greater than the minimum standards required by the Highways Agency, for the protection of premises in Orchard Park. Care should be taken to ensure the design and the selection of materials do not result in an increase in reflective noise and thereby increase the level of nuisance for the villages of Histon and Impington.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29058 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	Clear design and landscaping principles should be provided for any permanent noise barrier, including avoidance of reflected noise to the north or south. As the design of modern noise barriers is evolving, with good examples available in continental Europe, this should be fully explored.	The Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvement to the A14	<p>Amend paragraph 4.20 to read:  4.20. The A14 embankment and acoustic barrier acts as the backdrop to development on the land parcels along the northern edge of Orchard Park. The Government in its Comprehensive Spending Review in November 2010 withdrew the funding for the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvements scheme for the foreseeable future. The existing A14 noise barrier alongside Orchard Park will therefore remain in place for the foreseeable future. In the event that a scheme is brought forward for improvements to the A14, Policy SP/1 of the Site Specific Policies DPD establishes South Cambridgeshire District Council's requirements in relation to the appearance and functionality of any replacement noise barrier, or of any development. The impact of the long-term setting of Cambridge will be taken into account in determining planning applications.</p> <p>Add an additional paragraph to read:  4.34. Any considerations for the replacement of the noise barrier should ensure that any reflective noise is minimised to protect the villages of Histon and Impington to the north of the A14.</p> <p>Add an additional paragraph to read:  5.59. Any replacement noise barrier alongside the A14 should provide greater visual interest for both those travelling past on the A14 and for those viewing it from within Orchard Park. In so doing the noise barrier should provide noise attenuation equal to or greater than the minimum standards required by the Highways Agency, for the protection of premises in Orchard Park. Care should be taken to ensure the design and the selection of materials do not result in an increase in reflective noise and thereby increase the level of nuisance for the villages of Histon and Impington.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p><i>4.21</i></p> <p>29117 - Gallagher Estates</p>	Object	<p>The view only exists from the A14 interchange because the agreed planting scheme along the road embankment has not reached maturity.</p> <p>The agreed planting regime would not have been undertaken and it is clear that the planting strategy and in particular the combination of shrub and tree heights and sloping bank effectively means that in years to come no such view from the A14 interchange will exist.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.21 and the associated graphical representation of the view from the A14 Interchange on the figures, for example Figure 10 should be deleted.</p>	<p>From the elevated roundabout over the A14 at the Histon interchange, one of the few remaining views, from the north, of elements of the historic Cambridge skyline can be obtained. The A14 tree belt now falls outside the ownership of the Developer or the Council, therefore seeking retention of this view through the tree belt is not pertinent to this SPD. Efforts will be made to encourage the Highways Agency as landowner, in its management regimes, to ensure glimpses of this view can remain through the trees without detriment to the overall landscape feature.</p>	Delete the original paragraph 4.21.

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

*Noise*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29059 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	<p>Where there is development close to a noise and pollution source such as the A14, it should generally be commercial development before residential. Design should deal with noises issues from the outset. Where housing is to be developed on a noise sensitive site their design should avoid any aspect facing the noise source and that inactive rooms and spaces are located on noise sensitive aspects. If proposals to widen the A14 go ahead, the current noise barrier should be replaced. If they do not, measures to deal with the ongoing noise impacts should be developed further.</p>	<p>Noise and air quality issues are of major importance to any development at Orchard Park. The Council agrees that habitable rooms in residential properties adjacent to the A14 should not be facing the A14; hence in Section 6 the SPD recommends single aspect development to ensure habitable rooms in any residential properties adjacent to the A14 do not have a northerly aspect.</p>	<p>Reword paragraphs 4.26. to 4.33 to read: Noise 4.27. The ambient noise environment of the Orchard Park vacant land parcels is dominated by traffic noise from the A14. Noise can have a significant effect on the environment and on the quality of life experienced by individuals and communities.</p> <p>4.28. Being located alongside the A14 embankment, Orchard Park has always been vulnerable to issues of noise disturbance, addressed during the course of the original outline planning approval, resulting in the erection of an acoustic barrier, originally intended as a temporary measure but which will remain in place for the foreseeable future following the indefinite postponement of the planned A14 improvements. The acoustic impact of traffic noise emanating from the A14 is therefore a major influence for development choices on sites and developers should plan for the worst-case scenario.</p> <p>4.29. The control of noise to an acceptable level is a key design issue, and a requirement of the original design brief is to address the exposure to noise levels, highlighting that it is essential that the detailed design of built form within the study area achieves a maximum 'screening' affect from traffic noise emanating from the A14.</p> <p>4.30. The SPD provides general advice about how acoustic challenges could be addressed but the quality of development should not be compromised in addressing issues of noise attenuation in response to any future acoustic studies. Each application for development will need to undertake further noise assessments and plan development based on the worst-case scenario. In particular the key issue for these land parcels will be addressing impact on worker or residential amenity and the health and wellbeing of future residents in terms of providing acceptable noise levels both internally and in any external amenity areas.</p> <p>4.31. Noise implications of the A14 for the study</p>

**Representations**

**Nature Summary of Main Issue**

**Council's Assessment**

**Action**

land parcels should be assessed in accordance with the Noise Exposure Categories (NECs) for new residential dwellings in Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise. For non-residential uses British Standard 8233: 1999 'Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings Code of Practice' identifies specific internal noise level guidance that should be achieved within developments. The World Health Organisation "Guidelines for Community Noise" and "Night Noise Guidelines for Europe" should also be consulted.

4.32. Acceptable internal noise levels shall be achieved whilst meeting background and purge ventilation requirements at all times. The opening of any glazing / windows shall not compromise acceptable internal noise levels. Of particular concern is noise in relation to any rooms facing the A14.

4.33. Full consideration shall also be given to ensuring noise levels to external amenity spaces are also acceptable in accordance with the guidelines stated above.

Add a new paragraph 5.15 to read:  
5.15. Careful attention should be paid to the orientation of habitable rooms in relation to the noise and air quality issues pertaining to Orchard Park. Of particular concern are land parcels COM2a, COM2b/3, COM4 and L2, where no habitable rooms facing the A14 should be provided for any residential properties adjacent to the A14. Care should also be taken in the design of the built form to ensure air flows through all external areas to prevent pockets of poor air quality collecting.

Reword paragraphs 5.49. to 5.54 to read:  
5.53. The control of noise and air quality should be the starting point for good design. Residential development is inappropriate where national standards on noise and air quality cannot be met.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>5.54. It would be beneficial for buildings on the northern land parcels to be designed and placed in such a way so that they act as a noise barrier reducing the impact of noise from the A14 on the rest of the site, even with the retention of the A14 acoustic barrier. Not only should building location act as a screen to reduce noise from the A14, but also provide adequate noise mitigation to the occupiers of any residential development that may be proposed for the edge of the site.</p> <p>5.55. Residential properties should be located a minimum distance of 25m from the edge of the A14 carriageway.</p> <p>5.56. Any forthcoming proposals will have to respond to future air and noise assessments resulting from proposed improvements to the A14 and set out the measures required to achieve satisfactory mitigation. The level of impact and required response is dependent on the land use proposed.</p> <p>5.57. Any proposed development should address, through building design and architectural detailing, acoustic attenuation. This provides a significant opportunity to develop imaginative architectural responses to the acoustic demands of the site. As part of any noise insulation scheme, good noise mitigation measures such as appropriate configuration and layout of noise sensitive rooms should be designed into the overall development to avoid mechanical and whole house ventilation systems and acoustic glazing and ventilation schemes should be a last resort.</p> <p>5.58. It should be noted that The London Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy provides some useful advice on sound-conscious urban design and the following practical noise reduction issues / measures are viewed as relevant to the various plot options:  * Façade continuity and 'quiet side' - Buildings can be designed not only to protect their occupants, but to screen other areas from noise. High-density development following traditional</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>street blocks can reduce noise on the 'quiet side' by 10 to 20 dB(A).</p> <p>* Spaces between buildings - Although enclosed spaces can often be tranquil, tightly-enclosed spaces can also 'trap' sound, including from poorly designed, installed or maintained ventilation plant, waste facilities, vehicle manoeuvring, neighbours, or aircraft. The balance of advantage between contained and more open layouts will depend on the relative contributions of different noise sources. In noisy areas, acoustic absorbency within 'courtyard' areas should normally be maximised, especially from dense vegetation and soft ground. Rooftop planting may be useful on lower level roofs. In quieter spaces, sound reflection can help people sense where they are. Paving design should consider noise not just from road vehicles, but trolleys, and, particularly over or near bedrooms, footfall. 'Solar pergolas' with photovoltaic panels, could modify sound propagation.</p> <p>* Façade reflectivity - Multiple reflections between opposing, acoustically hard building surfaces increases noise levels. Façades at the wrong angle can reflect sound into quiet areas, as can curved and outward sloping buildings. Sound absorbing panels, deep acoustic profiling, 'absorptive banners' and other elements should be considered. A wider choice of acoustically absorptive materials needs to be developed, ideally using recycled materials.</p> <p>* Noise and height - High buildings, with less shielding from other buildings, may receive noise from a wider area. Stepping-back of upper floors, canopies and other projections can offer screening. Acoustic balconies, with high imperforate parapets and absorptive linings to the soffit of any projection above, can reduce noise at a window by 5 dB. The predictive capabilities of noise models need to be improved.</p> <p>* Vehicle access and parking - Waste storage and collection should be located away and/or screened</p>

**Representations**

**Nature Summary of Main Issue**

**Council's Assessment**

**Action**

from noise sensitive uses. Car parking and service areas should be screened, enclosed, or buffered with less sensitive uses.

\* Enclosed car parks and bays should be designed to minimise sound reverberation and breakout. Lockable gates to residential courtyards at night can reduce disturbance from vehicles and on-street revellers, especially in mixed-use areas, while avoiding the sort of exclusion associated with the 24- hour gated enclave.

\* Features of soundscape interest - Many sounds may be positive or negative depending on context (e.g. active water, wind in trees or rushes, loose surfaces, gratings, reverberant spaces).

\* Balancing needs - Passive solar design, in which homes need to face roughly south, may make it difficult to create a 'quiet side'. Noise screening could increase shading. More linking of buildings to reduce noise propagation may mean accepting some change in local character, although visual monotony can be avoided by setbacks and many other design features. The balance between noise reduction and other needs should take account of potential changes in noise sources, and in competing needs, over the lifetime of the development.

(Reference / Source: "Sunder City, The Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy, Mayor of London, March 2004", downloadable from: [http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/noise/docs/noise\\_strategy\\_all.pdf](http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/noise/docs/noise_strategy_all.pdf))

5.59. Any replacement noise barrier alongside the A14 should provide greater visual interest for both those travelling past on the A14 and for those viewing it from within Orchard Park. In so doing the noise barrier should provide noise attenuation equal to or greater than the minimum standards required by the Highways Agency, for the protection of premises in Orchard Park. Care should be taken to ensure the design and the selection of materials do not result in an increase in reflective noise and thereby increase the level of

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

nuisance for the villages of Histon and Impington.

---

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

4.26

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29025 - Cambridge City Council	Object	It is important that developments are designed from the outset to address noise issues. In particular it is essential to use single aspect, southerly facing, development if housing has to be considered on these sites. Such a development style would enhance passive solar heating as well as forming a noise barrier for existing development. Bathrooms, self-contained kitchens and hallways could potentially face the road with acoustic treatment to windows and ventilation.	Noise and air quality issues are of major importance to any development at Orchard Park. The Council agrees that habitable rooms in residential properties adjacent to the A14 should not be facing the A14; hence in Section 6 the SPD recommends single aspect development to ensure habitable rooms in any residential properties adjacent to the A14 do not have a northerly aspect.	<p>Reword paragraphs 4.26. to 4.33 to read: Noise</p> <p>4.27. The ambient noise environment of the Orchard Park vacant land parcels is dominated by traffic noise from the A14. Noise can have a significant effect on the environment and on the quality of life experienced by individuals and communities.</p> <p>4.28. Being located alongside the A14 embankment, Orchard Park has always been vulnerable to issues of noise disturbance, addressed during the course of the original outline planning approval, resulting in the erection of an acoustic barrier, originally intended as a temporary measure but which will remain in place for the foreseeable future following the indefinite postponement of the planned A14 improvements. The acoustic impact of traffic noise emanating from the A14 is therefore a major influence for development choices on sites and developers should plan for the worst-case scenario.</p> <p>4.29. The control of noise to an acceptable level is a key design issue, and a requirement of the original design brief is to address the exposure to noise levels, highlighting that it is essential that the detailed design of built form within the study area achieves a maximum 'screening' affect from traffic noise emanating from the A14.</p> <p>4.30. The SPD provides general advice about how acoustic challenges could be addressed but the quality of development should not be compromised in addressing issues of noise attenuation in response to any future acoustic studies. Each application for development will need to undertake further noise assessments and plan development based on the worst-case scenario. In particular the key issue for these land parcels will be addressing impact on worker or residential amenity and the health and wellbeing of future residents in terms of providing acceptable noise levels both internally and in any external amenity areas.</p> <p>4.31. Noise implications of the A14 for the study</p>

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

land parcels should be assessed in accordance with the Noise Exposure Categories (NECs) for new residential dwellings in Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise. For non-residential uses British Standard 8233: 1999 'Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings Code of Practice' identifies specific internal noise level guidance that should be achieved within developments. The World Health Organisation "Guidelines for Community Noise" and "Night Noise Guidelines for Europe" should also be consulted.

4.32. Acceptable internal noise levels shall be achieved whilst meeting background and purge ventilation requirements at all times. The opening of any glazing / windows shall not compromise acceptable internal noise levels. Of particular concern is noise in relation to any rooms facing the A14.

4.33. Full consideration shall also be given to ensuring noise levels to external amenity spaces are also acceptable in accordance with the guidelines stated above.

Add a new paragraph 5.15 to read:  
5.15. Careful attention should be paid to the orientation of habitable rooms in relation to the noise and air quality issues pertaining to Orchard Park. Of particular concern are land parcels COM2a, COM2b/3, COM4 and L2, where no habitable rooms facing the A14 should be provided for any residential properties adjacent to the A14. Care should also be taken in the design of the built form to ensure air flows through all external areas to prevent pockets of poor air quality collecting.

Reword paragraphs 5.49. to 5.54 to read:  
5.53. The control of noise and air quality should be the starting point for good design. Residential development is inappropriate where national standards on noise and air quality cannot be met.

5.54. It would be beneficial for buildings on the

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

northern land parcels to be designed and placed in such a way so that they act as a noise barrier reducing the impact of noise from the A14 on the rest of the site, even with the retention of the A14 acoustic barrier. Not only should building location act as a screen to reduce noise from the A14, but also provide adequate noise mitigation to the occupiers of any residential development that may be proposed for the edge of the site.

5.55. Residential properties should be located a minimum distance of 25m from the edge of the A14 carriageway.

5.56. Any forthcoming proposals will have to respond to future air and noise assessments resulting from proposed improvements to the A14 and set out the measures required to achieve satisfactory mitigation. The level of impact and required response is dependent on the land use proposed.

5.57. Any proposed development should address, through building design and architectural detailing, acoustic attenuation. This provides a significant opportunity to develop imaginative architectural responses to the acoustic demands of the site. As part of any noise insulation scheme, good noise mitigation measures such as appropriate configuration and layout of noise sensitive rooms should be designed into the overall development to avoid mechanical and whole house ventilation systems and acoustic glazing and ventilation schemes should be a last resort.

5.58. It should be noted that The London Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy provides some useful advice on sound-conscious urban design and the following practical noise reduction issues / measures are viewed as relevant to the various plot options:

\* Façade continuity and 'quiet side' - Buildings can be designed not only to protect their occupants, but to screen other areas from noise. High-density development following traditional street blocks can reduce noise on the 'quiet side'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>by 10 to 20 dB(A).</p> <p>* Spaces between buildings - Although enclosed spaces can often be tranquil, tightly-enclosed spaces can also 'trap' sound, including from poorly designed, installed or maintained ventilation plant, waste facilities, vehicle manoeuvring, neighbours, or aircraft. The balance of advantage between contained and more open layouts will depend on the relative contributions of different noise sources. In noisy areas, acoustic absorbency within 'courtyard' areas should normally be maximised, especially from dense vegetation and soft ground. Rooftop planting may be useful on lower level roofs. In quieter spaces, sound reflection can help people sense where they are. Paving design should consider noise not just from road vehicles, but trolleys, and, particularly over or near bedrooms, footfall. 'Solar pergolas' with photovoltaic panels, could modify sound propagation.</p> <p>* Façade reflectivity - Multiple reflections between opposing, acoustically hard building surfaces increases noise levels. Façades at the wrong angle can reflect sound into quiet areas, as can curved and outward sloping buildings. Sound absorbing panels, deep acoustic profiling, 'absorptive banners' and other elements should be considered. A wider choice of acoustically absorptive materials needs to be developed, ideally using recycled materials.</p> <p>* Noise and height - High buildings, with less shielding from other buildings, may receive noise from a wider area. Stepping-back of upper floors, canopies and other projections can offer screening. Acoustic balconies, with high imperforate parapets and absorptive linings to the soffit of any projection above, can reduce noise at a window by 5 dB. The predictive capabilities of noise models need to be improved.</p> <p>* Vehicle access and parking - Waste storage and collection should be located away and/or screened from noise sensitive uses. Car parking and service</p>

**Representations**

**Nature Summary of Main Issue**

**Council's Assessment**

**Action**

areas should be screened, enclosed, or buffered with less sensitive uses.

\* Enclosed car parks and bays should be designed to minimise sound reverberation and breakout. Lockable gates to residential courtyards at night can reduce disturbance from vehicles and on-street revellers, especially in mixed-use areas, while avoiding the sort of exclusion associated with the 24- hour gated enclave.

\* Features of soundscape interest - Many sounds may be positive or negative depending on context (e.g. active water, wind in trees or rushes, loose surfaces, gratings, reverberant spaces).

\* Balancing needs - Passive solar design, in which homes need to face roughly south, may make it difficult to create a 'quiet side'. Noise screening could increase shading. More linking of buildings to reduce noise propagation may mean accepting some change in local character, although visual monotony can be avoided by setbacks and many other design features. The balance between noise reduction and other needs should take account of potential changes in noise sources, and in competing needs, over the lifetime of the development.

(Reference / Source: "Sunder City, The Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy, Mayor of London, March 2004", downloadable from: [http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/noise/docs/noise\\_strategy\\_all.pdf](http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/noise/docs/noise_strategy_all.pdf))

5.59. Any replacement noise barrier alongside the A14 should provide greater visual interest for both those travelling past on the A14 and for those viewing it from within Orchard Park. In so doing the noise barrier should provide noise attenuation equal to or greater than the minimum standards required by the Highways Agency, for the protection of premises in Orchard Park. Care should be taken to ensure the design and the selection of materials do not result in an increase in reflective noise and thereby increase the level of nuisance for the villages of Histon and Impington.

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

4.27

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29026 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Assessments show that if the widening of the A14 occurs this will result in a slight worsening of noise from traffic to Orchard Park. The noise barrier will need to be upgraded and made permanent, if the A14 upgrade goes ahead. Also a clear strategy to tackle noise should be provided if the A14 upgrade does not materialise as per the current plans, this has not been provided in the SPD.	The Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the A14 Improvements scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvement to the A14 as set out at paragraph 2.5. of the SPD. The SPD needs updating to reflect the current position.	<p>Delete paragraph 2.5. and replace it with the following paragraph:  2.3. The Government's proposed A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement scheme had been identified as an opportunity to upgrade the noise barrier fence when it was being moved as part of the scheme, using developer contributions. However, the Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvements to the A14.</p> <p>Amend the original paragraph 4.29. referring to the A14 improvements.  4.28. Being located alongside the A14 embankment, Orchard Park has always been vulnerable to issues of noise disturbance, addressed during the course of the original outline planning approval, resulting in the erection of an acoustic barrier, originally intended as a temporary measure but which will remain in place for the foreseeable future following the indefinite postponement of the planned A14 improvements. The acoustic impact of traffic noise emanating from the A14 is therefore a major influence for development choices on sites and developers should plan for the worst-case scenario.</p> <p>Add a new paragraph:  5.59. Any replacement noise barrier alongside the A14 should provide greater visual interest for both those travelling past on the A14 and for those viewing it from within Orchard Park. In so doing the noise barrier should provide noise attenuation equal to or greater than the minimum standards required by the Highways Agency, for the</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
				protection of premises in Orchard Park. Care should be taken to ensure the design and the selection of materials do not result in an increase in reflective noise and thereby increase the level of nuisance for the villages of Histon and Impington.
<b>4.29</b>				
29116 - Gallagher Estates	Object	<p>It is clear that the 'with' and the 'without' A14 widening are different. Paragraph 3.3.1 of the Report states that "noise levels on site would actually be marginally quieter once the widening works are complete."</p> <p>Gallagher OBJECTS to the generalised statement in paragraph 4.29 and suggests it is reworded as follows: "...into account and although the Highway's Agency's draft Orders show that noise issues will remain very much as they currently are once the A14 improvements and its mitigation measure are in place, other more recent work suggests there may be reduced noise impacts. The worst-case scenario..."</p>	<p>The Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the A14 Improvements scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvement to the A14 as set out at paragraph 2.5. of the SPD. The SPD needs updating to reflect the current position, with paragraph 4.29. deleted.</p>	Delete the original paragraph 4.29.
29027 - Cambridge City Council	Object	<p>The SPD should also plan for the worst-case scenario in terms of noise mitigation, should the current A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton scheme not go ahead. The SPD should also give clear guidance on the replacement noise barrier if the A14 upgrade is confirmed, despite any delays.</p>	<p>The Government's decision as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review in autumn 2010 not to take forward the A14 Improvements scheme in its proposed form removes an identifiable means of implementing a change in the noise barrier at the time of writing, although work is in hand to explore alternative measures to deal with the congestion problems on the A14, which may provide similar opportunities. The policy objective to seek the upgrading of the noise barrier remains the policy for the barrier, with or without improvement to the A14 as set out at paragraph 2.5. of the SPD. The SPD needs updating to reflect the current position.</p> <p>The Council agrees that the worst case scenario should be planned for.</p>	<p>Amend the original paragraph 4.29. referring to the A14 improvements.</p> <p>4.28. Being located alongside the A14 embankment, Orchard Park has always been vulnerable to issues of noise disturbance, addressed during the course of the original outline planning approval, resulting in the erection of an acoustic barrier, originally intended as a temporary measure but which will remain in place for the foreseeable future following the indefinite postponement of the planned A14 improvements. The acoustic impact of traffic noise emanating from the A14 is therefore a major influence for development choices on sites and developers should plan for the worst-case scenario.</p>

**Representations**

**Nature Summary of Main Issue**

**Council's Assessment**

**Action**

4.34

29028 - Cambridge City Council

Object

The view of the City Council is that commercial uses in areas adjacent to the A14 and of poor air quality should be given more emphasis over other uses such as residential.

The Council considered all relevant factors affecting the potential for further residential development at Orchard Park when it carried out work to address a housing shortfall in the context of the Site Specific Policies DPD examination. This was subject to public consultation and all responses were taken into account by the Council and subsequently by the independent planning inspectors holding the examination. That detailed process concluded, on the basis of the evidence, that the suitability of the three land parcels for residential development was established. The sites are included as part of the Council's housing land supply for the period to 2016. The policy allocating Orchard Park for development makes clear that any planning applications must include noise, air quality and transport assessments to demonstrate in detail that the proposal is acceptable and can provide an appropriate residential environment. All planning applications for development proposals will be determined on their individual merits, having regard to the Council's adopted policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and other material factors.

Reword paragraph 4.36 to read:  
4.36. SCDC has a duty to protect future residents from the health effects of poor air quality. Such development should only take place if air quality objectives are being met and are likely to be met in the future or if adequate mitigation can be implemented.

4.38

29029 - Cambridge City Council

Object

The SPD suggests windows could be fixed shut in areas of poor air quality and mechanical ventilation along with scrubbing and filtration systems within the building could be used to mitigate against the shortcomings. The City Council considers this option is a last resort and new housing should not be allowed where air quality does not currently meet the National Air Quality Standards. There is also the issue of maintenance of this system, which, may be neglected leading to inadequate ventilation. Dispersion modelling of the key pollutants should be used to produce concentration contours to inform locations suitable for housing.

The SPD suggests windows could be fixed shut in areas of poor air quality and mechanical ventilation along with scrubbing and filtration systems within the building could be used to mitigate against the shortcomings.  
The City Council considers this option is a last resort and new housing should not be allowed where air quality does not currently meet the National Air Quality Standards. There is also the issue of maintenance of this system, which, may be neglected leading to inadequate ventilation. Dispersion modelling of the key pollutants should be used to produce concentration contours to inform locations suitable for housing.

It is for the applicant to undertake the necessary tests and demonstrate the appropriateness of any development on any site. One of the issues to be addressed is air quality. Where the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposals are acceptable the Council will not support them

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29060 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	It is neither appropriate nor sustainable to develop housing where air quality does not meet current national standards and where measures to mitigate against poor air quality include mechanical ventilation, filtration systems, winter gardens and fixed shut windows. No new housing should be developed in such location.	It is for the applicant to undertake the necessary tests and demonstrate the appropriateness of any development on any site. One of the issues to be addressed is air quality. Where the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposals are acceptable the Council will not support them.	Reword paragraph 4.36. to read: 4.36. SCDC has a duty to protect future residents from the health effects of poor air quality. Such development should only take place if air quality objectives are being met and are likely to be met in the future or if adequate mitigation can be implemented.
<i>4.40</i>				
29030 - Cambridge City Council	Comment	This section states that developments adjacent to or within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) should not cause a worsening of air quality. The proposed A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Scheme will, according to the Highway Agency's own modelling data, cause a worsening of air quality around the Cambridge Northern Bypass, which runs adjacent to Orchard Park and within the AQMA. Although the worsening air quality will not be drastic, and indeed the route as a whole will see a benefit, there will be a worsening around Orchard Park nevertheless, this SPD should take this on board.	The intention of this text was to highlight that any proposals for development should not result in a worsening of air quality in comparison to the assessments initially undertaken for the Orchard Park proposals.	Amend the original paragraph 4.40. to read: 4.39. Any new development adjacent to or within the AQMA should not cause a worsening of the air quality conditions predicted in the original assessment for the Orchard Park development. It is expected and advised that the developer will have regard to low emissions development and enters into early discussion with SCDC to agree the terms of a Low Emissions Strategy and ensure that LDF Policy NE/16 (Emissions) is achieved.
29061 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	This section states that developments adjacent to or within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) should not cause a worsening of air quality. The proposed A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton scheme will, according to the Highway Agency's own modelling data, cause a worsening of air quality around the Cambridge Northern Bypass, which runs adjacent to Orchard Park and within the AQMA, and this should be recognised within the SPD.	The intention of this text was to highlight that any proposals for development should not result in a worsening of air quality in comparison to the assessments initially undertaken for the Orchard Park proposals.	Amend the original paragraph 4.40. to read:  4.39. Any new development adjacent to or within the AQMA should not cause a worsening of the air quality conditions predicted in the original assessment for the Orchard Park development. It is expected and advised that the developer will have regard to low emissions development and enters into early discussion with SCDC to agree the terms of a Low Emissions Strategy and ensure that LDF Policy NE/16 (Emissions) is achieved

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 16 Constraints &amp; Opportunities</i>				
29133 - Unex Holdings Limited	Comment	Figure 10, Constraints and Opportunities (note - figure 16), does not show a vehicular access into parcel L2 nor into the eastern end of parcel COM 4.	Figure 16 fails to show a vehicular access into Plot L2, this needs correcting. Correct Figure 18 similarly.  The Arbury Camp Design Guide does not propose a vehicular link to the eastern end of COM4. A vehicular access here was considered but has not been proposed as there are concerns about safety due to the close proximity of such an access to the bend in Topper Street.	Figure 16 and 18 have been corrected to include a vehicular access to Plot L2.
29072 - Orchard Park Community Council	Comment	The vehicular route arrow on the first entrance to Orchard Park from Kings Hedges Road to the east of HRCC should be inbound and not outbound as currently shown.	This is an error that requires correcting.	The vehicular route arrow has been corrected to point in the correct direction.
29033 - Cambridge City Council	Comment	The vehicular route arrow on the first entrance to Orchard Park from Histon Road to the east of HRCC should be inbound and not outbound as currently shown.	This is an error that requires correcting.	The vehicular route arrow has been corrected to point in the correct direction.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<b>5. Design Principles</b>				
<i>Movement, Access &amp; Circulation</i>				
29062 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	It is critical that none of the remaining undeveloped plots in Orchard Park add to traffic and highways hazards. Orchard Park experiences serious problems with on-street car parking on unadopted roads at present and this should be prevented. Recent changes in policy at the County Council in regard to new developments allow for parking restrictions to be enforced prior to formal adoption by the Highways Authority. On-street spaces for car clubs should be provided.	<p>The County Council's Highways Department will be consulted on all development proposals and accordingly proposals will be assessed in relation to car parking and traffic flows and volumes. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p> <p>The Council shares the concerns of the Orchard Park Community Council and is actively seeking a solution to the problem. However this is not a matter for the SPD to address as the issue relates to the already developed highway infrastructure.</p>	<p>Amend Paragraph 5.7 to read:</p> <p>5.7. The road network to access the vacant land parcels is already in existence, therefore development proposals will have to address the capacity and characteristics of those access routes. Proposed site access to land parcel COM2a will predominantly be from Unwin Square upon the key approach to the Local Centre, which is a key arrival space and destination. Land parcel COM2b/3 is approached from one of the main access routes, Chieftain Way. The movement connections in this area of Orchard Park are intended to create a lively and accessible area, in keeping with the character area proposals. New development proposals will be expected to demonstrate the efficient management of traffic and reduce highway hazards through a well thought out layout and car parking design. The Council will not support development proposals that fail to meet the adopted standards.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>5.7</i>				
29031 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The remaining undeveloped plots in Orchard Park need to manage traffic and reduce highway hazards more efficiently than at present. Reference to Cambridgeshire County Council Highways Network Management Policies and Standards (August 2010) Section 15 should be made. The document requires road adoptions to be made as quickly as possible. Orchard Park experiences problems with on-street car parking on unadopted roads at present and this should be prevented. Road adoption allows for parking restrictions to be enforced.	<p>The County Council's Highways Department will be consulted on all development proposals and accordingly proposals will be assessed in relation to car parking and traffic flows and volumes. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p> <p>The Council shares the concerns of the Orchard Park Community Council and is actively seeking a solution to the problem. However this is not a matter for the SPD to address as the issue relates to the already developed highway infrastructure.</p>	<p>Amend Paragraph 5.7 to read:</p> <p>5.7. The road network to access the vacant land parcels is already in existence, therefore development proposals will have to address the capacity and characteristics of those access routes. Proposed site access to land parcel COM2a will predominantly be from Unwin Square upon the key approach to the Local Centre, which is a key arrival space and destination. Land parcel COM2b/3 is approached from one of the main access routes, Chieftain Way. The movement connections in this area of Orchard Park are intended to create a lively and accessible area, in keeping with the character area proposals. New development proposals will be expected to demonstrate the efficient management of traffic and reduce highway hazards through a well thought out layout and car parking design. The Council will not support development proposals that fail to meet the adopted standards.</p>
<i>5.8</i>				
29032 - Cambridge City Council	Comment	City Council officers encourage South Cambs to work together with the County Council to provide solutions to the movement and access problems on the sites. The SPD should not be encouraging the routing of traffic through the site and certainly not through residential area to access the plots in question.	<p>The County Council's highways Department will be consulted on all development proposals and will be assessed in relation to car parking and traffic flows and volumes. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p> <p>As the road network at Orchard Park exists it is unrealistic to request non-residential traffic to be directed away from residential areas. Remove this statement.</p>	<p>Reword paragraph 5.7 to read:</p> <p>5.7. The road network to access the vacant land parcels is already in existence, therefore development proposals will have to address the capacity and characteristics of those access routes. Proposed site access to land parcel COM2a will predominantly be from Unwin Square upon the key approach to the Local Centre, which is a key arrival space and destination. Land parcel COM2b/3 is approached from one of the main access routes, Chieftain Way. The movement connections in this area of Orchard Park are intended to create a lively and accessible area, in keeping with the character area proposals. New development proposals will be expected to demonstrate the efficient management of traffic and reduce highway hazards through a well thought out layout and car parking design. The Council will not support development proposals that fail to meet the adopted standards.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29128 - Unex Holdings Limited	Comment	The suggestion in paragraph 5.8 that "non-residential traffic should be directed away from residential areas" is unrealistic. All accesses into the site pass through residential areas. This paragraph, accordingly, should be deleted.	As the road network at Orchard Park exists it is unrealistic to request non-residential traffic to be directed away from residential areas. Remove this statement. The remainder of the paragraph remains valid.	<p>Amend paragraphs 5.7 and 5.8 to read:</p> <p>5.7. The road network to access the vacant land parcels is already in existence, therefore development proposals will have to address the capacity and characteristics of those access routes. Proposed site access to land parcel COM2a will predominantly be from Unwin Square upon the key approach to the Local Centre, which is a key arrival space and destination. Land parcel COM2b/3 is approached from one of the main access routes, Chieftain Way. The movement connections in this area of Orchard Park are intended to create a lively and accessible area, in keeping with the character area proposals. New development proposals will be expected to demonstrate the efficient management of traffic and reduce highway hazards through a well thought out layout and car parking design. The Council will not support development proposals that fail to meet the adopted standards.</p> <p>5.8. Careful treatment of the public realm should enhance the east-west connection along the commercial frontage, encouraging pedestrian and cycle movement to permeate through the site. This can be achieved by proposing active frontages, usable entrances and shared surfaces.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5.9 29063 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	Non residential and increases in residential traffic should be directed away from existing residential areas and the school. The original vision for Plots Q/HRCC would have seen relatively light traffic flow. Main access is restricted currently to one way ingress off Kings Hedges Road from the west. Other access points from the east through Graham Road and Chieftain Way, and up Chariot Way route traffic past the primary school and high density residential areas. Development should seek to minimise any increase in traffic flow through these areas and an alternative access/exit route to Kings Hedges Road be explored.	The County Council's Highways Department will be consulted on all development proposals and they will be assessed in relation to car parking and traffic flows, volumes and through a Safety Audit. Where development proposals fail to meet the Council's adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.	Amend paragraph 5.9. to read: 5.9. Access to land parcels Q and HRCC is via Ring Fort Road. Cambridgeshire County Council, as the County Highway Authority, has expressed 'in principle' preference for an access adjacent to the Orchard Park Primary school boundary to serve any development uses on the site, with a second access for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists via the cul-de-sac at the western end of Ring Fort Road. However it will be up to the applicants to demonstrate that such a provision is satisfactory in highways terms, especially as all traffic exiting these sites will have to pass the entrance to the Orchard Park Primary School. Provision of level access over the 'Iron Age' ditch is also to be adequately addressed by design proposals. Of key importance however, is the creation of a place that is safe, accessible and easy to move around.
5.27 29129 - Unex Holdings Limited	Comment	Paragraph 5.27 suggests that "tree planting should be used to ensure that the interface between residential uses and commercial uses is handed carefully and sensitively". This is contrary to the landscaping strategy in section 3.2 of the existing adopted Design Guide, and the planning consent, which determined that the trees would be within the pavements to create tree-lined boulevards.  It is now too late to amend this strategy as the trees have already been planted. Accordingly this paragraph should be deleted.	This statement refers to the interface between the western end of land parcel COM4 and Plot P, where the interface is not along a street to create a boulevard. The Arbury Camp Design Guide indicates a building frontage set back from the boundary with land parcel P, which would enable a landscape strip and footpath connection as indicated, without reducing the developable land further.	Amended paragraph 5.35. clarifies: 5.35. Figure 19 - Design Principles identifies an opportunity for a public realm connection between Chieftain Way and the public open space POS5. To ensure development on land parcel COM4 does not overbear on the existing residential development on land parcel P, which presents its side and the core of the block to COM4, the Arbury Camp Design Guide sets the face of development on COM4 (key frontage 3) back from the boundary with land parcel P. This would allow the creation of a footpath connection along the boundary without any loss of developable land, a varied townscape and sense of transition along the predominant east west elevations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>5.28</i>				
29130 - Unex Holdings Limited	Comment	The suggestion of a requirement "to enhance a landscape buffer alongside the A14 barrier" should be deleted. The strip of land at the foot of the barrier is an access strip required by the Highways Agency for maintenance and emergency access etc. The embankment has been landscaped as part of the original planning consent. If this landscaping has failed then that should be addressed with Gallagher and their contractor, Galliford Try.	The poor quality landscaping along the A14 embankment is in the ownership of the Highways Agency and outside the scope of this SPD. Whatever the reasons for the failures of that landscaping it is considered unacceptable that the occupiers of these sites adjacent to the A14 should have to face the current aspect, therefore the Council considers it appropriate for future developments to provide a landscape buffer to the site boundary with the A14 to ensure a better aspect is provided. Without such a landscape buffer to improve the aspect it is believed would be a hindrance to the developer finding tenants or purchasers.	Reword paragraph 5.28 to read: 5.28. The A14 embankment and noise barrier do not present an attractive aspect for users of the land parcels adjacent to the A14. Development proposals for land parcels adjacent to the A14 should include tree and shrub planting to improve the view towards the A14 for the benefit of the sites' users.
<i>5.29</i>				
29064 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	More detail should be given for landscaping requirements, particularly around car parking. Landscaping features should be used to break up car parking at regular intervals. Where there is development near to the A14, it is essential the landscape buffer is enhanced.	The text could be expanded for clarity.	Amend paragraphs 5.28 and 5.29 to read: 5.28. The A14 embankment and noise barrier do not present an attractive aspect for users of the land parcels adjacent to the A14. Development proposals for land parcels adjacent to the A14 should include tree and shrub planting to improve the view towards the A14 for the benefit of the sites' users.  5.29. To break up hard landscaped parking areas, soft landscaping should be used to create an attractive environment. Parking for no more than 6 cars should be provided in individual parking bays, with planting between bays of a size no less than one standard car-parking space and preferably at least the size of two standard car-parking bays. Shrub planting species should be selected to attain a height of 1.5m, except in locations where visibility is required for vehicular movement where species of 1m height should generally be used. Tree planting should be undertaken in each planting bed, with multiple trees planted in larger areas.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29036 - Cambridge City Council	Object	In this section minimum standards for the landscape should be set out such as heights for perimeter hedges around car parks which front onto residential areas (suggest 1.5m). Also setting standards for breaking up car parking clusters with planting/trees could be included, i.e. every 5 spaces. At present no criteria are set within the SPD. Diagrams to illustrate these standards should be considered. Plots adjacent to the A14 should have a mandatory requirement of enhancing the landscape buffer with native planting, this should not be optional.	The text could be expanded for clarity.	<p>Amend paragraphs 5.28 and 5.29 to read:</p> <p>5.28. The A14 embankment and noise barrier do not present an attractive aspect for users of the land parcels adjacent to the A14. Development proposals for land parcels adjacent to the A14 should include tree and shrub planting to improve the view towards the A14 for the benefit of the sites' users.</p> <p>5.29. To break up hard landscaped parking areas, soft landscaping should be used to create an attractive environment. Parking for no more than 6 cars should be provided in individual parking bays, with planting between bays of a size no less than one standard car-parking space and preferably at least the size of two standard car-parking bays. Shrub planting species should be selected to attain a height of 1.5m, except in locations where visibility is required for vehicular movement where species of 1m height should generally be used. Tree planting should be undertaken in each planting bed, with multiple trees planted in larger areas.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5.31 29037 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Green walls are difficult to establish, not sustainable and require a lot of maintenance. These should not be encouraged and reference should be removed from the SPD	<p>The land parcels are visible from the raised roundabout above the A14 at the Histon interchange and from the Cambridge Road as it rises to the roundabout affording unimpeded views down into the land parcel. Consideration should be given to providing landscape features on land parcels Q &amp; HRCC other than conventional on-the-ground-planting in response to the specific nature of this site and how it is viewed from outside. This presents the opportunity for highly visible green roofs and green walls. This is particularly important in relation to land parcels Q &amp; HRCC due to the original intention for buildings here to be in a parkland setting.</p> <p>The tops of taller buildings on the other northern fringe sites will also be visible from the A14 embankment above the noise barrier. The requirement to consider roof gardens and green walls should be equally applied to those sites.</p>	<p>Reword paragraphs 5.30 and 5.31 to read:</p> <p>5.30. The landscape design scheme for the southwest corner site should include appropriate planting to provide an attractive parkland setting to the buildings, in accordance with the Arbury Camp Design Guide. Of particular concern are the views of and into the site from the surrounding areas. The developer should incorporate an attractive buffer along the western edge of the site to merge with that existing along the highway embankment.</p> <p>5.31. Views are afforded down into the site from the elevated interchange over the A14 and from Cambridge Road as it rises to the interchange. This increases the visibility of land parcel Q and creates the potential for views of development from a higher elevation, other than that expected at the development's ground level. The layout and design of the development should therefore provide adequate planting and explore the possibility of incorporating green roofs or brown roofs and green walls to address the elevated views of the development. Similar consideration should be given to the provision of green roofs or brown roofs and green walls on the parts of development on the land parcels alongside the A14, where they will be seen above the noise barrier or through the Perspex panels. Particular attention should be paid to the design of green roofs, brown roofs and green walls, where used, in relation to their ongoing management and maintenance to ensure their successful establishment and retention.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29114 - Gallagher Estates	Object	<p>Object to the statement that is essential to explore new technologies to address landscape design on the SW corner site. No justification is provided to support this statement and why it applies to the Q &amp; HRCC parcel. Conventional approaches to landscape design may be equally appropriate, would need to be considered in the context of the layout, built form, scale and massing of buildings.</p> <p>Reference to the SW corner should be deleted fro this paragraph and further justification provided to support this approach with consideration to the context of the layout, built form, scale and massing of buildings.</p>	<p>The site is visible from the raised roundabout above the A14 at the Histon interchange and from the Cambridge Road as it rises to the roundabout affording unimpeded views down into the site. Consideration should be given to providing landscape features on land parcels Q &amp; HRCC other than conventional on-the-ground-planting in response to the specific nature of this site and how it is viewed from outside. This presents the opportunity for highly visible green roofs and green walls. This is particularly important in relation to site Q &amp; HRCC due to the original intention for buildings here to be in a parkland setting.</p> <p>The tops of taller buildings on the other northern fringe sites will also visible from the A14 embankment above the noise barrier. The requirement to consider roof gardens and green walls should be equally applied to those sites.</p> <p>Remove the reference to "new technologies" which is misleading.</p>	<p>Reword paragraphs 5.30 and 5.31 to read: 5.30. The landscape design scheme for the southwest corner site should include appropriate planting to provide an attractive parkland setting to the buildings, in accordance with the Arbury Camp Design Guide. Of particular concern are the views of and into the site from the surrounding areas. The developer should incorporate an attractive buffer along the western edge of the site to merge with that existing along the highway embankment.</p> <p>5.31. Views are afforded down into the site from the elevated interchange over the A14 and from Cambridge Road as it rises to the interchange. This increases the visibility of land parcel Q and creates the potential for views of development from a higher elevation, other than that expected at the development's ground level. The layout and design of the development should therefore provide adequate planting and explore the possibility of incorporating green roofs or brown roofs and green walls to address the elevated views of the development. Similar consideration should be given to the provision of green roofs or brown roofs and green walls on the parts of development on the land parcels alongside the A14, where they will be seen above the noise barrier or through the Perspex panels. Particular attention should be paid to the design of green roofs, brown roofs and green walls, where used, in relation to their ongoing management and maintenance to ensure their successful establishment and retention.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29065 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	Greater consideration should be given to what is already in place at Orchard Park and if it has worked, for example the green roof on the Community Centre. Consideration should also be given to the success rate of alternative landscape design such as green walls.	<p>The land parcels are visible from the raised roundabout above the A14 at the Histon interchange and from the Cambridge Road as it rises to the roundabout affording unimpeded views down into the land parcel. Consideration should be given to providing landscape features on land parcels Q &amp; HRCC other than conventional on-the-ground-planting in response to the specific nature of this site and how it is viewed from outside. This presents the opportunity for highly visible green roofs and green walls. This is particularly important in relation to land parcels Q &amp; HRCC due to the original intention for buildings here to be in a parkland setting.</p> <p>The tops of taller buildings on the other northern fringe sites will also be visible from the A14 embankment above the noise barrier. The requirement to consider roof gardens and green walls should be equally applied to those sites.</p>	<p>Reword paragraphs 5.30 and 5.31 to read:</p> <p>5.30. The landscape design scheme for the southwest corner site should include appropriate planting to provide an attractive parkland setting to the buildings, in accordance with the Arbury Camp Design Guide. Of particular concern are the views of and into the site from the surrounding areas. The developer should incorporate an attractive buffer along the western edge of the site to merge with that existing along the highway embankment.</p> <p>5.31. Views are afforded down into the site from the elevated interchange over the A14 and from Cambridge Road as it rises to the interchange. This increases the visibility of land parcel Q and creates the potential for views of development from a higher elevation, other than that expected at the development's ground level. The layout and design of the development should therefore provide adequate planting and explore the possibility of incorporating green roofs or brown roofs and green walls to address the elevated views of the development. Similar consideration should be given to the provision of green roofs or brown roofs and green walls on the parts of development on the land parcels alongside the A14, where they will be seen above the noise barrier or through the Perspex panels. Particular attention should be paid to the design of green roofs, brown roofs and green walls, where used, in relation to their ongoing management and maintenance to ensure their successful establishment and retention.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>5.34</i>				
29112 - Gallagher Estates	Comment	COMMENT that following the approval of the Travelodge on Parcel COM 3 this paragraph appears to be unnecessary and can be deleted. The proposals for the built form appear to relate to Parcel COM 3 rather than COM 2b.	<p>The Travelodge scheme on COM3 has been approved, but the guidance in the SPD remains valid until construction of that approval is completed on site, in case the construction of the development fails to be completed and alternative proposals are brought forward.</p> <p>The principles remain valid for the eastern end of plot COM2b which is visible from Chieftain Way.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 5.34 to read: 5.34. Land parcel COM2b/3 provides an opportunity to create an active development frontage contributing to an active streetscape (key frontage 2) responding sensitively to the residential development opposite. This should be achieved by treatment of the public realm, varied articulation of built form, and entrances addressing the street. Should the approved Travelodge proposals on land parcel COM3 fail to be constructed, any subsequent proposals for development must address this issue. The undeveloped eastern end of land parcel COM2b is visible from Chieftain Way and this issue is applicable to that area.</p>
<i>5.35</i>				
29131 - Unex Holdings Limited	Comment	The proposed public realm connection between Chieftain Way and the public open space in front of Plot COM 4 is not realistic or achievable. The provision and layout of footpaths are all as per the original planning consent and have already been constructed on site. The existing Landowners Agreement equalises between the landowners the amount of non-developable land take such as roads, footpaths and public open space etc. It is too late to try to introduce a new public footpath across a net developable plot without further affecting the viability of that plot.	This statement refers to the interface between the western end of land parcel COM4 and Plot P, where the interface is not along a street to create a boulevard. The Arbury Camp Design Guide indicates a building frontage set back from the boundary with land parcel P, which would enable a landscape strip and footpath connection as indicated, without reducing the developable land further.	Amended paragraph 5.35. clarifies: 5.35. Figure 19 - Design Principles identifies an opportunity for a public realm connection between Chieftain Way and the public open space POS5. To ensure development on land parcel COM4 does not overbear on the existing residential development on land parcel P, which presents its side and the core of the block to COM4, the Arbury Camp Design Guide sets the face of development on COM4 (key frontage 3) back from the boundary with land parcel P. This would allow the creation of a footpath connection along the boundary without any loss of developable land, a varied townscape and sense of transition along the predominant east west elevations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 18 Overall Design Principles</i>				
29134 - Unex Holdings Limited	Comment	<p>The vehicular access into the eastern end of parcel COM 4 is missing.</p> <p>The "key public realm link" across the western end of parcel COM 4 will not be provided as it will further restrict an already constrained site and will significantly affect the viability of development.</p> <p>In addition, pushing the development northwards, at the western end of parcel COM 4, will bring it closer to the main sewerage pumping station which is undesirable.</p> <p>Insufficient development is shown on parcel L2. This would render the development of this parcel unviable.</p>	<p>The Arbury Camp Design Guide does not propose a vehicular link to the eastern end of COM4. A vehicular access here was considered but has not been proposed as there are concerns about safety due to the close proximity of such an access to the bend in Topper Street.</p> <p>The SPD suggests a public realm link between the western end of land parcel COM4 and Plot P. The Arbury Camp Design Guide indicates a building frontage set back from the boundary with land parcel P, which would enable a landscape strip and footpath connection as indicated, without reducing the developable land further.</p> <p>The development proposals require reconsideration in relation to the sewerage pumping station.</p> <p>The SPD illustrates only the key design principles that the Council wishes to see developers address. Therefore the development indicated is not necessarily the total development that could be on a site. It is for the developer to bring forward development proposals for the site that address these key principles.</p>	
29024 - Cambridge City Council	Comment	<p>The key needs adjusting in order to be read clearly. Why is there a development height restriction zone in parcel Q?</p>	<p>All figures will be checked for clarity and readability and amended appropriately where necessary.</p> <p>From the elevated roundabout over the A14 at the Histon interchange, one of the few remaining views from the north of elements of the historic Cambridge skyline can be obtained. The A14 tree belt now falls outside the ownership of the Developer or the Council, therefore seeking retention of this view through the tree belt is not pertinent to this SPD. Efforts will be made to encourage the Highways Agency as landowner, in its management regimes, to ensure glimpses of this view can remain through the trees without detriment to the overall landscape feature. Paragraph 4.21 will be amended to remove the reference for the long distance view through the A14 tree belt. Figure 18 will be similarly amended to remove the long distance view across site Q.</p>	<p>The key has been amended to ensure full readability.</p> <p>Figure 18 has been amended to remove the long distance view across land parcel Q.</p>

Figure 18 Overall Design Principles

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Public Realm &amp; Public Art</i>				
29066 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	Examples of high quality public realm should be illustrated and specified. Linkages should be made to adjacent plots to ensure co-ordination. Street clutter should be minimised, including Highway signage and street furniture. Public art can contribute to the quality of place and should be used to add to, though not instead of, public realm contributions.	<p>Clarify that the design of the public realm should be of high quality and undertaken in a manner to ensure compatibility with the design and materials selection for adjoining sites.</p> <p>Add to the text that the design of the public realm should be undertaken in a manner that ensures the necessary street furniture is located appropriately ensuring street clutter is minimised.</p> <p>Clarify that public art can contribute to the quality of place and should be used to add to, though not instead of, the design of a high quality public realm.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 5.42 to read: 5.42. The design of the public realm should be of a high quality, throughout Orchard Park with the aim of achieving a visually interesting development and undertaken in a manner to ensure compatibility with the design and materials selection for adjoining sites. The design of the public realm should be undertaken in a well-considered manner that ensures the necessary street furniture is located appropriately to avoid street clutter.</p> <p>5.43. Public art can contribute to the quality of place and should be used to add to, but is not a substitute for, the design of a high quality public realm. For further guidance on Public Art Strategy and Public Realm details refer to the Arbury Camp Design Guide. For all Public art proposals developers are expected to refer to the Public Art SPD (2009).</p>

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

*Parking*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29067 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	<p>The parking provision as currently implemented is wholly inadequate. Every opportunity should be taken in this guidance to correct this including a requirement for interim parking management pending highway adoption. The starting point should be parking to the front of units, drawing on the English Partnerships guidance What Works and avoiding rear courtyard parking.</p> <p>Suitable cycling provision should be mandatory, well located and designed to encourage use with easy access and natural surveillance. Garages should be designed to allow for cycle parking as well as car parking. Best practice in cycle stand design should be illustrated and specified.</p>	<p>The Arbury Camp Design Guide sets out an overall approach to car parking for Orchard Park. A fundamental departure from this overall strategy could result in development not being compatible with the existing developments. Reference will be made to the English Partnerships guidance What Works Where, however the principles in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking on the vacant sites. Careful consideration will be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed.</p> <p>The County Council's Highways Department will be consulted on all development proposals and will be assessed in relation to car parking and traffic flows and volumes. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p> <p>The Council shares the concerns of the Orchard Park Community Council and is actively seeking a solution to the problem. However this is not a matter for the SPD to address.</p> <p>Clarify that the Council's District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire states that garages should be of sufficient size to accommodate a large car together with cycle storage, some degree of other storage and room to pass a garaged car with wheeled bins and cycles.</p>	<p>Reword paragraphs 5.43. to 5.45. to read: 5.44. Issues of car parking and traffic movement, form a key aspect of good design with a strong desire to reducing the dominance of the car. The District Council looks to encourage the creation of good streetscape within modern developments that provides its users with a sense of pride. Appropriate and alternative means of parking provision need to be tested to achieve the above on the South West Corner land parcel, which is more visible from the adjacent elevated A14 junction and its ramped access road. To provide appropriate well-designed proposals for parking within developments, developers should refer to the English Partnerships guidance "What Works Where". However, the car parking principles established in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking, on the vacant land parcels, which advocates a maximum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling (a standard that will be reviewed in the light of the changes to Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13) Transport, following its update on 3rd January 2011, see paragraph 1.11.). Where lower levels of car parking provision are appropriate they will be encouraged. To assist in reducing dependence on private motorcars, developers are encouraged to consider providing at Orchard Park, an extension of the existing 'car club' provision in Cambridge, which is a rapidly expanding facility within the city. Careful consideration should be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed and are fully integrated with it. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p> <p>5.45. Indicative car parking areas are shown on Figure 19. Car parking and servicing within the land parcels immediately adjacent to the A14 is generally indicated on the north side of buildings, to enable amenity space, especially for any residential properties, to be located in more favourable locations to the south of the buildings and enable stronger frontages to the adjacent</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>public realm and land parcels. The design of buildings should define and address these rear spaces appropriately to provide secure, overlooked parking where the opportunity for crime is minimised. The opportunity also exists to incorporate undercroft parking as part of the proposals, to assist in increasing the height of buildings to better enable them to act as noise barriers for the development.</p>
			<p>5.46. To break up hard landscaped parking areas, soft landscaping should be used to create an attractive environment. Parking for no more than 6 cars should be provided in individual parking bays, with planting between bays no less than the size of one standard car-parking space and preferably at least the size of two standard car-parking bays. Shrub planting species should be selected to attain a height of 1.5m, except in locations where visibility is required for vehicular movement where species of 1m height should generally be used. Tree planting should be undertaken in each planting bed, with multiple trees planted in larger areas.</p>
			<p>5.47 The Council's "District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire" states that garages should be provided of an adequate size for car parking and to allow circulation past the vehicle; advising the minimum size should be 3.3m X 6.0m and should have an additional allowance along one side or at the end for storage. Garage provision provides an opportunity to incorporate cycle storage, but for it to be effective the additional storage and circulation space within the garage is essential.</p>
			<p>5.48. Higher levels of cycle parking are required due to the location of Orchard Park, close to the city centre and on bus routes, potentially reducing car dependency. Adequate levels of cycle parking, which is convenient to access and use, is covered and secure and afforded high levels of natural surveillance, should be incorporated within the design and layout of individual land parcels, as set out in the South Cambridgeshire District Council's parking standards. See also The "District Design</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
				<p>Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Design in South Cambridgeshire". Cycle parking for employees should also be convenient, covered, secure and afforded high levels of natural surveillance. Public cycle parking should be of the "Sheffield" type to ensure cycles can be parked conveniently and securely.</p> <p>5.49. Developers should make the necessary arrangements with Cambridgeshire County Council to ensure the speedy adoption of highways.</p>

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

5.43

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29132 - Unex Holdings Limited	Comment	Undercroft parking is not financially viable on this site, particularly in the current depressed market.	Car parking proposals should be considered for their appropriateness for the development proposals being brought forward; accordingly no particular approach should be ruled in or ruled out but the proposals considered with an open mind. Make reference to the English Partnerships guidance What Works Where; however clarify that the car parking principles in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking on the vacant sites. Add that careful consideration will be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed. The SPD aims to provide direction to approach the design of the vacant sites, for development proposals that will come forward at some time in the future when the market conditions may or may not be those currently being experienced.	<p>Amend paragraph 5.43. to read: 5.44. Issues of car parking and traffic movement, form a key aspect of good design with a strong desire to reducing the dominance of the car. The District Council looks to encourage the creation of good streetscape within modern developments that provides its users with a sense of pride. Appropriate and alternative means of parking provision need to be tested to achieve the above on the South West Corner land parcel, which is more visible from the adjacent elevated A14 junction and its ramped access road. To provide appropriate well-designed proposals for parking within developments, developers should refer to the English Partnerships guidance "What Works Where". However, the car parking principles established in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking, on the vacant land parcels, which advocates a maximum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling (a standard that will be reviewed in the light of the changes to Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13) Transport, following its update on 3rd January 2011, see paragraph 1.11.). Where lower levels of car parking provision are appropriate they will be encouraged. To assist in reducing dependence on private motorcars, developers are encouraged to consider providing at Orchard Park, an extension of the existing 'car club' provision in Cambridge, which is a rapidly expanding facility within the city. Careful consideration should be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed and are fully integrated with it. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p> <p>5.45. Indicative car parking areas are shown on Figure 19. Car parking and servicing within the land parcels immediately adjacent to the A14 is generally indicated on the north side of buildings, to enable amenity space, especially for any residential properties, to be located in more favourable locations to the south of the buildings and enable stronger frontages to the adjacent</p>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
				public realm and land parcels. The design of buildings should define and address these rear spaces appropriately to provide secure, overlooked parking where the opportunity for crime is minimised. The opportunity also exists to incorporate undercroft parking as part of the proposals, to assist in increasing the height of buildings to better enable them to act as noise barriers for the development.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29039 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The Design Guidance at present makes provision for car parking spaces on the north side of the buildings, allowing for a stronger design frontage, with undercroft parking to be provided. The City Council is of the view that parking should be located at the front of properties on new developments, as this gives safety and crime reduction benefits due to the increased visibility	When development proposals are brought forward on the plots adjacent to the A14 it is preferable to locate both public and private amenity space in more favourable positions to the south of the buildings, resulting in the suggestion to locate car parking to the north to facilitate the provision of amenity space to the south. This also maintains consistency with the Arbury Camp Design Guide. Designs will have to give due regard to maximizing natural surveillance of car parking and other public realm areas and minimising opportunities for crime.	<p>Reword paragraph 5.43. to read: 5.44. Issues of car parking and traffic movement, form a key aspect of good design with a strong desire to reducing the dominance of the car. The District Council looks to encourage the creation of good streetscape within modern developments that provides its users with a sense of pride. Appropriate and alternative means of parking provision need to be tested to achieve the above on the South West Corner land parcel, which is more visible from the adjacent elevated A14 junction and its ramped access road. To provide appropriate well-designed proposals for parking within developments, developers should refer to the English Partnerships guidance "What Works Where". However, the car parking principles established in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking, on the vacant land parcels, which advocates a maximum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling (a standard that will be reviewed in the light of the changes to Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13) Transport, following it's update on 3rd January 2011, see paragraph 1.11.). Where lower levels of car parking provision are appropriate they will be encouraged. To assist in reducing dependence on private motorcars, developers are encouraged to consider providing at Orchard Park, an extension of the existing 'car club' provision in Cambridge, which is a rapidly expanding facility within the city. Careful consideration should be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed and are fully integrated with it. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p> <p>5.45. Indicative car parking areas are shown on Figure 19. Car parking and servicing within the land parcels immediately adjacent to the A14 is generally indicated on the north side of buildings, to enable amenity space, especially for any residential properties, to be located in more favourable locations to the south of the buildings and enable stronger frontages to the adjacent</p>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			public realm and land parcels. The design of buildings should define and address these rear spaces appropriately to provide secure, overlooked parking where the opportunity for crime is minimised. The opportunity also exists to incorporate undercroft parking as part of the proposals, to assist in increasing the height of buildings to better enable them to act as noise barriers for the development.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29038 - Cambridge City Council	Object	<p>The City Council previously made comments on parking and cycle parking provision at Orchard Park at Environment Scrutiny Committee in June 2009. A report identified the lack of on-street parking enforcement, due to roads not having been adopted leading to problems such as blocking of the highway. The report found that there was a severe lack of appropriate cycle parking provision and considered that existing problems need to be overcome to give the car and cycle parking plans within the SPD credibility. It is important that mistakes from initial phases of development are considered in developing principles for undeveloped plots.</p>	<p>The Arbury Camp Design Guide sets out an overall approach to car parking for Orchard Park. A fundamental departure from this overall strategy could result in development not being compatible with the existing developments. Reference will be made to the English Partnerships guidance What Works Where, however the principles in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking on the vacant sites. Careful consideration will be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed.</p> <p>The County Council's Highways Department will be consulted on all development proposals and will be assessed in relation to car parking and traffic flows and volumes. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p> <p>The Council shares the concerns of Cambridge City Council and is actively seeking a solution to the problem. However this is not a matter for the SPD to address.</p> <p>Clarify that the Council's District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire states that garages should be of sufficient size to accommodate a large car together with cycle storage, some degree of other storage and room to pass a garaged car with wheeled bins and cycles.</p> <p>The Orchard Park Design Guidance SPD has been prepared with due regard to the recommendations of the "Arbury Park Scrutiny Review Final Report October 2008". The preparation of the Orchard Park Design Guidance SPD is in accordance with recommendation 1e of the "Arbury Park Scrutiny Review Final Report October 2008" to provide design guidance for "design aspects not covered in the main Design Guide".</p>	<p>Reword paragraphs 5.43. to 5.45. to read: 5.44. Issues of car parking and traffic movement, form a key aspect of good design with a strong desire to reducing the dominance of the car. The District Council looks to encourage the creation of good streetscape within modern developments that provides its users with a sense of pride. Appropriate and alternative means of parking provision need to be tested to achieve the above on the South West Corner land parcel, which is more visible from the adjacent elevated A14 junction and its ramped access road. To provide appropriate well-designed proposals for parking within developments, developers should refer to the English Partnerships guidance "What Works Where". However, the car parking principles established in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking, on the vacant land parcels, which advocates a maximum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling (a standard that will be reviewed in the light of the changes to Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13) Transport, following its update on 3rd January 2011, see paragraph 1.11.). Where lower levels of car parking provision are appropriate they will be encouraged. To assist in reducing dependence on private motorcars, developers are encouraged to consider providing at Orchard Park, an extension of the existing 'car club' provision in Cambridge, which is a rapidly expanding facility within the city. Careful consideration should be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed and are fully integrated with it. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p> <p>5.45. Indicative car parking areas are shown on Figure 19. Car parking and servicing within the land parcels immediately adjacent to the A14 is generally indicated on the north side of buildings, to enable amenity space, especially for any residential properties, to be located in more favourable locations to the south of the buildings and enable stronger frontages to the adjacent</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>public realm and land parcels. The design of buildings should define and address these rear spaces appropriately to provide secure, overlooked parking where the opportunity for crime is minimised. The opportunity also exists to incorporate undercroft parking as part of the proposals, to assist in increasing the height of buildings to better enable them to act as noise barriers for the development.</p>
			<p>5.46. To break up hard landscaped parking areas, soft landscaping should be used to create an attractive environment. Parking for no more than 6 cars should be provided in individual parking bays, with planting between bays no less than the size of one standard car-parking space and preferably at least the size of two standard car-parking bays. Shrub planting species should be selected to attain a height of 1.5m, except in locations where visibility is required for vehicular movement where species of 1m height should generally be used. Tree planting should be undertaken in each planting bed, with multiple trees planted in larger areas.</p>
			<p>5.47 The Council's "District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire" states that garages should be provided of an adequate size for car parking and to allow circulation past the vehicle; advising the minimum size should be 3.3m X 6.0m and should have an additional allowance along one side or at the end for storage. Garage provision provides an opportunity to incorporate cycle storage, but for it to be effective the additional storage and circulation space within the garage is essential.</p>
			<p>5.48. Higher levels of cycle parking are required due to the location of Orchard Park, close to the city centre and on bus routes, potentially reducing car dependency. Adequate levels of cycle parking, which is convenient to access and use, is covered and secure and afforded high levels of natural surveillance, should be incorporated within the design and layout of individual land parcels, as set out in the South Cambridgeshire District Council's parking standards. See also The "District Design</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Design in South Cambridgeshire". Cycle parking for employees should also be convenient, covered, secure and afforded high levels of natural surveillance. Public cycle parking should be of the "Sheffield" type to ensure cycles can be parked conveniently and securely.</p> <p>5.49. Developers should make the necessary arrangements with Cambridgeshire County Council to ensure the speedy adoption of highways.</p> <p>In Section 1 add a new paragraph to read:  1.12. During the preparation of the SPD full regard has been taken to the recommendations made by the "Arbury Park Scrutiny Review Final Report October 2008". The preparation of this SPD is in accordance with recommendation 1e of the "Arbury Park Scrutiny Review Final Report October 2008" to provide design guidance for "design aspects not covered in the main Design Guide".</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5.44	Comment	<p>The SPD advocates a maximum of 1.5 car parking spaces per dwelling in order to help encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport, such as cycling, walking and public transport. However, there is currently no power for the local authority to enforce on-street parking measures as the roads are not yet adopted, and therefore people are parking on the roads and pavements. This has led to roads being cluttered and blocked, causing subsequent issues for bus access, and also for cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>The Arbury Camp Design Guide sets out an overall approach to car parking for Orchard Park. A fundamental departure from this overall strategy could result in development not being compatible with the existing developments. Reference will be made to the English Partnerships guidance What Works Where, however the principles in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking on the vacant sites. Careful consideration will be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed.</p> <p>The County Council's Highways Department will be consulted on all development proposals and will be assessed in relation to car parking and traffic flows and volumes. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p> <p>The Council shares the concerns of Cambridge City Council and is actively seeking a solution to the problem of highway adoption and uncontrolled parking. However this is not a matter for the SPD to address.</p>	<p>Reword the text to read:</p> <p>5.44. Issues of car parking and traffic movement, form a key aspect of good design with a strong desire to reducing the dominance of the car. The District Council looks to encourage the creation of good streetscape within modern developments that provides its users with a sense of pride. Appropriate and alternative means of parking provision need to be tested to achieve the above on the South West Corner land parcel, which is more visible from the adjacent elevated A14 junction and its ramped access road. To provide appropriate well-designed proposals for parking within developments, developers should refer to the English Partnerships guidance "What Works Where". However, the car parking principles established in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking, on the vacant land parcels, which advocates a maximum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling (a standard that will be reviewed in the light of the changes to Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13) Transport, following it's update on 3rd January 2011, see paragraph 1.11.). Where lower levels of car parking provision are appropriate they will be encouraged. To assist in reducing dependence on private motorcars, developers are encouraged to consider providing at Orchard Park, an extension of the existing 'car club' provision in Cambridge, which is a rapidly expanding facility within the city. Careful consideration should be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed and are fully integrated with it. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p> <p>5.49. Developers should make the necessary arrangements with Cambridgeshire County Council to ensure the speedy adoption of highways.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29082 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Given the current extent of site occupation, existing car ownership levels should be identified and used to inform the level of car parking required in these final phases.	<p>The Arbury Camp Design Guide sets out an overall approach to car parking for Orchard Park. A fundamental departure from this overall strategy could result in development not being compatible with the existing developments. Reference will be made to the English Partnerships guidance What Works Where, however the principles in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking on the vacant sites. Careful consideration will be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed.</p> <p>Parking standards will be reviewed in the light of the changes to Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13) Transport, following its update on 3rd January 2011.</p> <p>The County Council's Highways Department will be consulted on all development proposals and will be assessed in relation to car parking and traffic flows and volumes. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p>	<p>A new paragraph 1.11. has been added to read: 1.11. Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13) Transport was updated on 3rd January 2011, with amendments to paragraph 51 Parking Standards. PPG13 still requires parking standards to be set locally through development plans and the emphasis remains on the efficient use of land and promoting sustainable transport choices. However the change allows Councils to set appropriate standards for their area, rather than being specifically required to set a maximum standard. South Cambridgeshire District Council will, as part of the review of the Core Strategy / Development Control Policies DPD that will begin in 2011, review the standards included in the Development Control Policies DPD, and consider what types of standard, and what levels of parking, are appropriate for the district. In the meantime, Development Control Policies DPD Policy TR/2 'Car and Cycle Parking Standards', (with standards set out in appendix 1), remains the adopted policy of the Council.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29040 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The City Council objects to the lack of guidance provided on cycle parking in the SPD. Current cycle provision at Orchard Park is insufficient and where it is provided is inadequate. Cycle parking standards should be set in the SPD; this should include cycle racks and storage by the front doors of properties where there is more natural surveillance and easier access. Best practice guidance should be included along with illustrations.	<p>Amend the text to state that secure and covered cycle parking should be provided for all properties.</p> <p>Clarify that the Council's District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire states that garages should be of sufficient size to accommodate a large car together with cycle storage, some degree of other storage and room to pass a garaged car with wheeled bins.</p>	<p>Amend the reference to cycle parking to read: 5.47 The Council's "District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire" states that garages should be provided of an adequate size for car parking and to allow circulation past the vehicle; advising the minimum size should be 3.3m X 6.0m and should have an additional allowance along one side or at the end for storage. Garage provision provides an opportunity to incorporate cycle storage, but for it to be effective the additional storage and circulation space within the garage is essential.</p> <p>5.48. Higher levels of cycle parking are required due to the location of Orchard Park, close to the city centre and on bus routes, potentially reducing car dependency. Adequate levels of cycle parking, which is convenient to access and use, is covered and secure and afforded high levels of natural surveillance, should be incorporated within the design and layout of individual land parcels, as set out in the South Cambridgeshire District Council's parking standards. See also The "District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Design in South Cambridgeshire". Cycle parking for employees should also be convenient, covered, secure and afforded high levels of natural surveillance. Public cycle parking should be of the "Sheffield" type to ensure cycles can be parked conveniently and securely.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5.45 29109 - Gallagher Estates	Object	<p>OBJECT to the statement that appropriate and alternative means of parking provision need to be tested in respect of development on the South West corner site. No justification is provided to support this statement and why it applies particularly to the Q &amp; HRCC parcel. Appropriate parking proposals will need to be developed in the context of the layout and design of buildings.</p> <p>The sentence "Appropriate and alternative means of parking provision need to be tested to achieve the above on the South West Corner site" should be deleted.</p>	<p>Views into land parcels Q &amp; HRCC from the adjacent elevated roundabout over the A14 at the Histon interchange and from the ramped section of Cambridge Road to the west of the site, make surface car parking areas considerably more visible than from a view at the same level as the car parking. This requirement is to seek alternative approaches to car parking to minimise its visual intrusion into views from outside the site.</p>	<p>Reword paragraph 5.45. to read: 5.44. Issues of car parking and traffic movement, form a key aspect of good design with a strong desire to reducing the dominance of the car. The District Council looks to encourage the creation of good streetscape within modern developments that provides its users with a sense of pride. Appropriate and alternative means of parking provision need to be tested to achieve the above on the South West Corner land parcel, which is more visible from the adjacent elevated A14 junction and its ramped access road. To provide appropriate well-designed proposals for parking within developments, developers should refer to the English Partnerships guidance "What Works Where". However, the car parking principles established in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking, on the vacant land parcels, which advocates a maximum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling (a standard that will be reviewed in the light of the changes to Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13) Transport, following it's update on 3rd January 2011, see paragraph 1.11.). Where lower levels of car parking provision are appropriate they will be encouraged. To assist in reducing dependence on private motorcars, developers are encouraged to consider providing at Orchard Park, an extension of the existing 'car club' provision in Cambridge, which is a rapidly expanding facility within the city. Careful consideration should be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed and are fully integrated with it. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5.47 29081 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	<p>Water efficiency: The Orchard Park SPD could encourage greater water efficiency in residential developments by stipulating a target for daily water use.</p> <p>Climate change adaption: The SPD could promote greater resilience by being more explicit in the need to adapt to and mitigate for the effects of the urban heat island.</p>	<p>Clarify the text that developers are encouraged to attain the highest standards of sustainability in the design of buildings and remove the reference to the minimum standards prescribed by the Government, which developers have to comply with. To specify targets comparable to code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 or 5 undermines the encouragement to attain the highest standards. Add encouragement for reducing water consumption.</p> <p>Add to the text a specific reference that designs for development should mitigate for the effects of the urban heat island. However a materials and finishes palette for Orchard Park is included in the Arbury Park Design Guide which failure to continue to use could undermine the design ethos of Orchard Park as a whole. Materials selection will have to be agreed on their merits on a site by site basis.</p>	<p>Reword paragraphs 5.46. and 5.47. to read: 5.50. All new development, whether residential commercial or mixed use, should be energy efficient in terms of design, density, location and orientation. The "District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Design in South Cambridgeshire" states that "sustainability should be at the heart of good design" and provides further guidance on sustainability. Careful consideration should be given in the design of developments to maximise daylight and solar gain to premises to reduce the need for artificial lighting and heating, whilst preventing overheating that might result in a need for the mechanical cooling of buildings. Consideration should also be given to addressing the effects of the urban heat island.</p> <p>5.51. Developers are encouraged to construct properties that attain the highest standards of sustainable design and construction and address the issues of climate change, for the lifetime of the development. Residential properties should exceed the minimum standards prescribed by the Government under the Code for Sustainable Homes and non-residential buildings should exceed a minimum BREEAM rating of 'Good'. Developers are encouraged to promote suitable environmental measures through building design to reduce the amount of CO<sub>2</sub>m<sup>3</sup> / year emitted by 10%, compared to the minimum Building Regulations requirement; and comply with District Council's policy to provide at least 10% of the development's predicted energy requirements through the use of renewable energy technologies (Policies NE/1, NE/2 and NE/3, LDF). Developers are also encouraged to design and construct premises with greater standards of water efficiency. To assist developers in preparing to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 requirements in 2016, they are encouraged to set a target for water consumption in residential properties of between 80 litres and 105 litres per person per day i.e. the equivalent to Code Levels 4 or 5.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29068 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	The design guidance should seek to encourage developers to achieve sustainable development which exceed rather than meet the minimum Code for Sustainable Homes / BREAAAM standards. High standards of sustainability should be at the heart of the SPD and not a bolt on minimum standard as currently phrased and which could constrain developers in achieving higher standards on undeveloped parcels.	Developers are encouraged to attain the highest standards of sustainability in the design of buildings. The reference to the minimum standards prescribed by the Government, which developers have to comply with, will be removed.	<p>Amend paragraphs 5.46 and 5.47 to read: 5.50. All new development, whether residential commercial or mixed use, should be energy efficient in terms of design, density, location and orientation. The "District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Design in South Cambridgeshire" states that "sustainability should be at the heart of good design" and provides further guidance on sustainability. Careful consideration should be given in the design of developments to maximise daylight and solar gain to premises to reduce the need for artificial lighting and heating, whilst preventing overheating that might result in a need for the mechanical cooling of buildings. Consideration should also be given to addressing the effects of the urban heat island.</p> <p>5.51. Developers are encouraged to construct properties that attain the highest standards of sustainable design and construction and address the issues of climate change, for the lifetime of the development. Residential properties should exceed the minimum standards prescribed by the Government under the Code for Sustainable Homes and non-residential buildings should exceed a minimum BREEAM rating of 'Good'. Developers are encouraged to promote suitable environmental measures through building design to reduce the amount of CO2m3 / year emitted by 10%, compared to the minimum Building Regulations requirement; and comply with District Council's policy to provide at least 10% of the development's predicted energy requirements through the use of renewable energy technologies (Policies NE/1, NE/2 and NE/3, LDF). Developers are also encouraged to design and construct premises with greater standards of water efficiency. To assist developers in preparing to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 requirements in 2016, they are encouraged to set a target for water consumption in residential properties of between 80 litres and 105 litres per person per day i.e. the equivalent to Code Levels 4 or 5.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29042 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The City Council objects to the minimum standards required in the SPD in terms of Code for Sustainable Homes. The City is extremely disappointed in this minimal aspiration, which is not in keeping with the vision for this site, or political aspirations for the quality of new development in and around Cambridge. The Orchard Park development this should seek to deliver sustainable development that goes beyond the minimum standards set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM.	Developers are encouraged to attain the highest standards of sustainability in the design of buildings. The reference to the minimum standards prescribed by the Government, which developers have to comply with, will be removed.	<p>Amend paragraphs 5.46 and 5.47 to read: 5.50. All new development, whether residential commercial or mixed use, should be energy efficient in terms of design, density, location and orientation. The "District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Design in South Cambridgeshire" states that "sustainability should be at the heart of good design" and provides further guidance on sustainability. Careful consideration should be given in the design of developments to maximise daylight and solar gain to premises to reduce the need for artificial lighting and heating, whilst preventing overheating that might result in a need for the mechanical cooling of buildings. Consideration should also be given to addressing the effects of the urban heat island.</p> <p>5.51. Developers are encouraged to construct properties that attain the highest standards of sustainable design and construction and address the issues of climate change, for the lifetime of the development. Residential properties should exceed the minimum standards prescribed by the Government under the Code for Sustainable Homes and non-residential buildings should exceed a minimum BREEAM rating of 'Good'. Developers are encouraged to promote suitable environmental measures through building design to reduce the amount of CO<sub>2</sub>m<sup>3</sup> / year emitted by 10%, compared to the minimum Building Regulations requirement; and comply with District Council's policy to provide at least 10% of the development's predicted energy requirements through the use of renewable energy technologies (Policies NE/1, NE/2 and NE/3, LDF). Developers are also encouraged to design and construct premises with greater standards of water efficiency. To assist developers in preparing to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 requirements in 2016, they are encouraged to set a target for water consumption in residential properties of between 80 litres and 105 litres per person per day i.e. the equivalent to Code Levels 4 or 5.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5.48 29043 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The City Council recognises that combustion of biomass to fuel renewable energy technologies impacts on air quality and as such is not acceptable within Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA). However, the SPD fails to recognise other means of using biomass (pyrolysis, gasification, anaerobic digestion) do not have the same air quality impacts, and therefore, subject to other constraints, maybe suitable. As currently worded, the draft SPD discounts all forms of biomass heat and energy generation. The SPD should not restrict future use of these technologies. Paragraph 5.48 should be amended making specific reference to biomass combustion being unsuitable.	Biomass is referred to specifically to identify concerns that potentially biomass could result in a worsening of air quality in the Air Quality Management Area. Amend the text to clarify that certain technologies may negatively impact on air quality and should not be used, but other technologies that do not negatively impact on air quality should be considered.	Amend paragraph 5.48. to read: 5.52. Developers are encouraged to consider all options of achieving 10% of provision of energy from renewable sources. However, whilst biomass is a cost effective method of achieving 10% provision of energy from renewables, it may have an impact on local air quality due to NOx and PM10 emissions. The developer should explore biomass technologies such as pyrolysis, gasification and anaerobic digestion, which have been acknowledged to have a lesser air quality impact. Developers will be expected to justify the chosen technologies.
29069 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	Biomass is not the sole renewable technology option and full consideration should be given to details of a range of low carbon options and use of renewable energy, referencing existing use of technology on the development, including solar thermal, and wind power as used at the primary school. The definition of biomass is also unclear as there are many forms - for example combustion, anaerobic digestion, gasification) - and as currently worded the SPD discounts all form of biomass heat and energy generation.	Biomass is referred to specifically to identify concerns that potentially biomass could result in a worsening of air quality in the Air Quality Management Area. Amend the text to clarify that certain technologies may negatively impact on air quality and should not be used, but other technologies that do not negatively impact on air quality should be considered.	Amend paragraph 5.48. to read: 5.52. Developers are encouraged to consider all options of achieving 10% of provision of energy from renewable sources. However, whilst biomass is a cost effective method of achieving 10% provision of energy from renewables, it may have an impact on local air quality due to NOx and PM10 emissions. The developer should explore biomass technologies such as pyrolysis, gasification and anaerobic digestion, which have been acknowledged to have a lesser air quality impact. Developers will be expected to justify the chosen technologies.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5.49 29044 - Cambridge City Council	Object	To make buildings a noise barrier when abutting the A14 they need to be single aspect. If residential is to be considered the difficulty of accommodating amenity areas in these plots should be recognised.	<p>Noise issues are of major importance to any development at Orchard Park. The Council agrees that habitable rooms in residential properties adjacent to the A14 should not be facing the A14; hence in Section 6 the SPD recommends single aspect development to ensure habitable rooms in any residential properties adjacent to the A14 do not have a northerly aspect.</p> <p>For sites adjacent to the A14 the design guidance in Section 6 directs the provision of amenity space to the south side of buildings to more appropriate locations in relation to both noise and air quality.</p> <p>This principle will be clarified in the text.</p>	<p>Add a new paragraph 5.15 to read: 5.15. Careful attention should be paid to the orientation of habitable rooms in relation to the noise and air quality issues pertaining to Orchard Park. Of particular concern are land parcels COM2a, COM2b/3, COM4 and L2, where no habitable rooms facing the A14 should be provided for any residential properties adjacent to the A14. Care should also be taken in the design of the built form to ensure air flows through all external areas to prevent pockets of poor air quality collecting.</p>
29070 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	Design should deal with noise issues from the start. Where housing is to be developed on a noise sensitive site it should avoid any aspect facing the noise source. Designs should ensure that inactive rooms and spaces are located on noise sensitive aspects and the difficulty of accommodating external individual and communal amenity areas in these plots should be recognised.	<p>Noise issues are of major importance to any development at Orchard Park. The Council agrees that habitable rooms in residential properties adjacent to the A14 should not be facing the A14; hence in Section 6 the SPD recommends single aspect development to ensure habitable rooms in any residential properties adjacent to the A14 do not have a northerly aspect.</p> <p>For sites adjacent to the A14 the design guidance in Section 6 directs the provision of amenity space to the south side of buildings to more appropriate locations in relation to both noise and air quality.</p> <p>This principle will be clarified in the text.</p>	<p>Add a new paragraph 5.15 to read: 5.15. Careful attention should be paid to the orientation of habitable rooms in relation to the noise and air quality issues pertaining to Orchard Park. Of particular concern are land parcels COM2a, COM2b/3, COM4 and L2, where no habitable rooms facing the A14 should be provided for any residential properties adjacent to the A14. Care should also be taken in the design of the built form to ensure air flows through all external areas to prevent pockets of poor air quality collecting.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5.55 29071 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	Waste storage and collection should be accessible and practical and designed to fit current waste storage bins.	The text will be amended to state that waste storage should be conveniently accessible to use, allow convenient movement of bins to the collection point; and clarify that storage for bins should adequately accommodate the Council's requirement for the storage of bins, with reference to the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.	Amend original paragraph 5.55. to read: 5.60. Adequate storage provision and separation for trade and domestic waste is also an important design consideration. Waste and recycling provision should be in accordance with RECAP Waste Management Design Guide 2008, which has been adopted as Council Policy. Adherence to this guidance will ensure that waste storage and collection will be accessible, practical and convenient for daily use by residents and / or business premises and complies with the Council's current requirements.

**Representations****Nature Summary of Main Issue****Council's Assessment****Action****6. Site Specific Design Principles****6. Site Specific Design Principles**29079 - Orchard Park  
Community Council

Object

The SPD provides tables setting out key design principles and criteria for each plot and divides them into essential and desirable. The Community Council considers that the majority of the desirable are in fact essential in stating the ambitions for the sites. Any watering down of the criteria could undermine the vision for the remaining development sites by permitting low quality development. It is crucial to learn from the mistakes from the initial development phases and use undeveloped plots to raise urban design standards across the site. Landscaping criteria should be expressed as a minimum and not a maximum.

The matters identified in the tables in Section 6 have been reconsidered to ensure they clearly identify the essential criteria and other criteria omitted.

The tables in Section 6 have been amended to ensure they clearly identify the essential criteria and other criteria omitted.

**6.1**

29045 - Cambridge City Council

Object

The SPD provides tables setting out key design principles to be addressed for each of the plots. The criteria are set into essential and desirable lists. The City Council questions the need for desirable principles to be set out, it would be more appropriate to strengthen the essential section and provide a more concise set of principles for each of the plots. The clear setting out of essential criteria would provide a strong starting point for stating the ambitions for the sites. The present tables showing essential and desirable criteria could undermine the overall vision for the remaining development sites.

The matters identified in the tables in Section 6 have been reconsidered to ensure they clearly identify the essential criteria and other criteria omitted.

The tables in Section 6 have been amended to ensure they clearly identify the essential criteria and other criteria omitted.

**6.2**

29046 - Cambridge City Council

Object

All references in the design principles of providing up to 20% landscape in the plots should be removed as this effectively allows developers to provide 0%. It would be more appropriate to set minimum rather than maximum standards for the sites in terms of landscape.

The reference for up to 20% of each commercial plot to be landscaped is stated within the Arbury Camp Design Guide (p100) and the SPD was carrying that intention forward.

To prevent confusion this statement will be removed. Paragraph 5.26 has been amended to reflect the provision of new open space.

The references to providing up to 20% landscape on plots have been removed.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Plot Q &amp; HRCC</i>				
29047 - Cambridge City Council	Object	<p>The essential criteria is that air quality and noise levels are modelled and contoured on mapping so that appropriate design criteria can be conditioned. Specific criteria such as World Health Organisation internal and external noise levels and National Air Quality Objectives could be set out (this applies to Plot K1 also)</p> <p>Traffic levels and access/egress into and out of this site need to be considered carefully in terms of impact on Orchard Park. It is essential that potential problems with access be raised clearly in the SPD, to avoid adverse impact on residents of Ring Fork Road and Chariot Way.</p>	<p>Developers will be required to undertake an appropriate noise study to direct the design of their proposals as directed in paragraph 4.30. Previous tests have indicated the suitability, in principle, of permitting the alternative land uses on these sites. It is for the developer to demonstrate that the proposals are appropriately designed and address all issues impacting on the design.</p> <p>The main text addresses the World Health Organisation noise levels and National Air Quality Objectives.</p> <p>The County Council's highways Department will be consulted on all development proposals and will be assessed in relation to car parking and traffic flows and volumes. Where development proposals fail to meet the adopted standards they will not be supported by the Council. The main text addresses this matter.</p>	<p>The main text has been amended to clarify these matters.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29073 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	<p>Height of buildings adjacent to the school boundary two storey. Main entrance required off Kings Hedges Road to minimise traffic impact. Most parking to be in front of units. Prioritise pedestrian/cycle movement encouraging connections throughout the site. Give minimum percentage of landscaping required. Public amenity space should be required.</p> <p>The various figures showing the principles for the parcels should be far clearer with more detail including landscaping.</p> <p>A suitable noise study should be undertaken so accurate mapping can be given for each parcel. Better connections with existing developed sites to ensure coherent development should be made.</p>	<p>The intention is for two-storey development adjacent to and in proximity to the school boundary; the text will be strengthened to improve clarity.</p> <p>The Highway Authority have indicated that another vehicular entrance from Kings Hedges Road into land parcels Q &amp; HRCC would not be acceptable due to the close proximity to both the Cambridge Road and guided bus junctions with Kings Hedges Road.</p> <p>The car parking principles in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking on the vacant sites and that careful consideration should be given to the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed.</p> <p>The Council agrees that pedestrian and cycle movement and connectivity from each site to the surrounding parts of Orchard Park should be maximised.</p> <p>The minimum percentage of public amenity space and landscaping required is in accordance with the Council's adopted policies.</p> <p>The figures are intended to illustrate only the key principles for the design of the site that would apply to any development proposal. More detailed design direction would only be pertinent to a specific design for a specific use and will vary from scheme to scheme and are therefore not appropriate for inclusion on the figure illustrating the key principles.</p> <p>Developers will be required to undertake an appropriate noise study to direct the design of their proposals as directed in paragraph 4.30. Previous tests have indicated the suitability, in principle, of permitting the alternative land uses on these sites. It is for the developer to demonstrate that the proposals are appropriately designed and address all issues impacting on the design.</p>	<p>The text is amended to state, "Development adjacent to the school boundary should not exceed 2 storeys."</p> <p>The text is amended to state, "Integrate parking appropriately into the design for development."</p> <p>The text is amended to state, "Pedestrian and cycle connections with POS1 should be created."</p> <p>The text is amended to state, "Provide open space provision in accordance with the Council's policy requirements."</p> <p>The figure title has been amended to state, "Key Design Principles."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29035 - Cambridge City Council	Object	<p>Figures 19, 20a, 20b, 21a, 21b, 22a, 22b, 23a, 23b, 24</p> <p>The diagrams setting out principles for the sites and parcels should be more precise and detailed. More robust mapping of air quality and noise levels and also more specific maps to indicate planting areas and species would be more useful for the Local Authority and to guide the developer. No detailed diagrams showing noise decibel levels and air quality data have been provided.</p>	<p>The figures are intended to illustrate only the key principles for the design of the site that would apply to any development proposal. More detailed design direction would only be pertinent to a specific design for a specific use and will vary from scheme to scheme and are therefore not appropriate for inclusion on the figure illustrating the key principles.</p> <p>Developers will be required to undertake an appropriate noise study to direct the design of their proposals as directed in paragraph 4.30. Previous tests have indicated the suitability, in principle, of permitting the alternative land uses on these sites. It is for the developer to demonstrate that the proposals are appropriately designed and address all issues impacting on the design.</p>	<p>The figure title has been amended to state, "Key Design Principles."</p>
29126 - Gallagher Estates	Object	<p>OBJECTION is made to the essential requirement for a minimum building height of 9m. If residential development is proposed on Plots Q &amp; HRCC, this minimum height may restrict the type and form of residential development that would be suitable here. It will be desirable for building heights to vary across the parcel but other than those buildings that front onto POS 1, there appears to be no opportunity to have buildings less than 9m. For example the viability and desirability of houses as well as flats may be assessed and this option should not be excluded by this SPD.</p>	<p>The 9m building height requirement is generally based on the provision of three storey residential buildings fronting onto Kings Hedges Road and continuing the development of 3 storey house or apartments along Kings Hedges Road, established in the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007. This need not be a continuous built frontage, nor must it have a continuous uniform eaves and ridge height; but should be designed in a manner that overall visually reads as 3 storeys and the built form of which relates to the existing built frontage on both sides of Kings Hedges Road. Other houses behind the Kings Hedges Road and Cambridge Road frontages could be 2 storey.</p>	<p>Make the following amendments to the table for land parcels Q/HRCC: Generally a 9m building height for primary frontages; not necessarily a continuous built frontage; should not have a continuous eaves line; but should appear as a three story built form.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29034 - Cambridge City Council	Object	<p>Figures 19, 20a, 20b, 21a, 21b, 22a, 22b, 23a, 23b, 24</p> <p>The diagrams setting out principles for the sites and parcels should be more precise and detailed. More robust mapping of air quality and noise levels and also more specific maps to indicate planting areas and species would be more useful for the Local Authority and to guide the developer. No detailed diagrams showing noise decibel levels and air quality data have been provided.</p>	<p>The figures are intended to illustrate only the key principles for the design of the site that would apply to any development proposal. More detailed direction would only be pertinent to a specific design for a specific use and will vary from scheme to scheme and are therefore not appropriate for inclusion on the figure illustrating the key principles.</p> <p>Developers will be required to undertake an appropriate noise study to direct the design of their proposals as directed in paragraph 4.30. Previous tests have indicated the suitability, in principle, of permitting the alternative land uses on these sites. It is for the developer to demonstrate that the proposals are appropriately designed and address all issues impacting on the design.</p>	The figure title has been amended to state, "Key Design Principles."
29080 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>It is positive that the importance of appropriately addressing the boundary with the school is acknowledged, as is the proposal that there appears to be a landscape buffer suggested as being included along this sensitive boundary, as is the recognised need to ensure that the massing of buildings adjacent to the school should not over-shadow or compromise the amenity.</p>	The comment is welcomed.	None.
<i>Plot Com2a</i>				
29123 - Gallagher Estates	Comment	<p>Elsewhere on Plot COM 2a the desirable, minimum height of 7m may restrict the type and form of residential development that would be suitable in this location. For example the viability and desirability of houses as well as flats may be assessed for this location. In order not to exclude this possibility before testing layouts, including for noise mitigation, the reference to '7m' should be replaced by '6m'.</p>	<p>The stated 7m building height is the minimum desired building height based on two residential storeys plus a low pitch or flat roof. Building heights could be greater than this minimum.</p>	The text has been reworded to increase clarity.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29125 - Gallagher Estates	Comment	COMMENT generally on the relationship between COM 2a and COM 2b. With COM 3 now having the benefit of planning permission for a Travelodge hotel, the relationship between COM 2a and COM 2b should be considered further. It is possible for example that a highway link between the two parcels may be provided and that the layout and orientation of COM 2b could relate more to COM 2a and Unwin Square. In this last scenario, the indicative vehicle accesses (and the location of frontages shown on the COM 2b) may be different.	The proposal does not preclude land parcel COM2b being developed in association with land parcel COM2a. If such a proposal was brought forward the two land parcels should be design as one, addressing the key design criteria set out for both.	No action required.
29124 - Gallagher Estates	Object	Although proposals for retail development would front onto Unwin Square, the property type and therefore scale and massing of any potential residential uses is not yet defined. On this basis OBJECTION is made to the minimum height of 10m fronting the public square. The reference to 10m should be replaced with 7m. Alternatively the 'essential' requirement for scale and massing should be amended to read "Building height of 15m (maximum) and 10m (minimum) fronting the public square is recommended."	The view to this site from Kings Hedges Road along Chariot Way and Circus Drive is the primary view within the Orchard Park development. This view is between the 4 storey circus and therefore requires a building of sufficient height and visual emphasis to provide a strong visual conclusion to the view. A building of 7m height i.e. of little greater height than a two storey residential property fails to adequately provide the visual stop required. 10m is considered an appropriate minimum height for the closure to this view.	The text has been reworded to increase clarity.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29048 - Cambridge City Council	Object	<p>Plot COM2a, Plot Com2b/3, Plot COM4 and Plot L2</p> <p>It will be essential for air quality to agree and set a minimum distance from the carriageway in addition to the comments set out in Plot and HCC. Additionally most of the desirable criteria indicated for noise and air quality should be classed as essential.</p> <p>Cross-sections should be extended into the existing residential areas to provide context for the sites. Plot K1 is also included in this recommendation.</p> <p>Plot Com 2a has previously had consent for development, how does this fit into the design guidance?</p>	<p>Developers will be required to undertake an appropriate noise study to direct the design of their proposals as directed in paragraph 4.30. Previous tests have indicated the suitability, in principle, of permitting the alternative land uses on these sites. It is for the developer to demonstrate that the proposals are appropriately designed and address all issues impacting on the design.</p> <p>A minimum distance from the A14 embankment for the location of residential properties has been added in paragraph 5.55.</p> <p>Reconsider the matters identified in the tables in Section 6 to ensure they are correctly identified as essential or desirable.</p> <p>Check all cross section drawings to identify if existing neighbouring buildings exist that should be shown on the cross sections.</p> <p>The draft SPD is prepared on the basis that the consented scheme for Plot COM2a may not be built and therefore sets out the key principles any new development proposals would be required to address.</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added to read: 5.55. Residential properties should be located a minimum distance of 25m from the edge of the A14 carriageway.</p> <p>The figure title has been amended to state, "Key Design Principles."</p>
29122 - Gallagher Estates	Object	<p>OBJECTION is made to the requirement for up to 20% of each plot to be landscaped. Although it is noted as a 'desirable' feature for each plot rather than 'essential', the basis for this requirement is not explained. For example this may be a requirement for soft, planted landscaping rather than hard, surfaced landscaping and may be interpreted as additional to any other open space that might be provided on a plot. This bullet point should be deleted.</p>	<p>The intention for up to 20% of each commercial plot to be landscaped is a requirement of the Arbury Camp Design Guide (p100). The SPD carried that intention forward. This is the same space requirement as for the open space provision, which should be in accordance with the Council's policy, and is not an additional requirement.</p>	<p>Replace the requirement for up to 20% of each plot to be landscaped, with the statement "Provide open space provision in accordance with the Council's policy requirements."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29074 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	<p>What significance is given to the consented scheme for Plot Com 2a. Specific criteria for air quality and noise levels could be included and aligned to indicators from World Health Organisation and National Air Quality Objectives. Criteria could set out a minimum distance from the carriageway or A14 for buildings.</p> <p>The various figures showing the principles for the parcels should be far clearer with more detail including landscaping. A suitable noise study should be undertaken so accurate mapping can be given for each parcel. Better connections with existing developed sites to ensure coherent development should be made.</p>	<p>The draft SPD is prepared on the basis that the consented scheme for Plot COM2a may not be built and therefore sets out the key principles any new development proposals would be required to address.</p> <p>Reference is made in Section 4 to the Council's Low emissions strategy. Development proposals will be required to meet those relevant standards.</p> <p>A minimum distance from the A14 embankment for the location of residential properties has been added in paragraph 5.55.</p> <p>The figures are intended to illustrate only the key principles for the design of the site that would apply to any development proposal. More detailed design direction would only be pertinent to a specific design for a specific use and will vary from scheme to scheme and are therefore not appropriate for inclusion on the figure illustrating the key principles.</p> <p>Developers will be required to undertake an appropriate noise study to direct the design of their proposals as directed in paragraph 4.30. Previous tests have indicated the suitability, in principle, of permitting the alternative land uses on these sites. It is for the developer to demonstrate that the proposals are appropriately designed and address all issues impacting on the design.</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added to read: 5.55. Residential properties should be located a minimum distance of 25m from the edge of the A14 carriageway.</p> <p>The figure title has been amended to state, "Key Design Principles."</p>
<hr/>				
<i>Plot Com2b/3</i>				
29121 - Gallagher Estates	Comment	COMMENT that the references to 'square' in the 'essential' column appear to be superfluous.	This is not a misplaced reference to Unwin Square. The 'square' adjacent to the access road is a design aspiration for the overall benefit of the public realm and townscape. The landscaped area provided at this location in the Travelodge permission provides this function. This is an appropriate requirement that the existing application intends to deliver and remains a valid requirement until the Travelodge development is completed on site.	No action to be taken.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29120 - Gallagher Estates	Object	OBJECTION is made to the requirement for up to 20% of each plot to be landscaped. Although it is noted as a 'desirable' feature for each plot rather than 'essential', the basis for this requirement is not explained. For example this may be a requirement for soft, planted landscaping rather than hard, surfaced landscaping and may be interpreted as additional to any other open space that might be provided on a plot. This bullet point should be deleted.	The intention for up to 20% of each commercial plot to be landscaped is a requirement of the Arbury Camp Design Guide (p100). The SPD carried that intention forward. This is the same space requirement as for the open space provision, which should be in accordance with the Council's policy, and is not an additional requirement.	Replace the requirement for up to 20% of each plot to be landscaped, with the statement "Provide open space provision in accordance with the Council's policy requirements."
29119 - Gallagher Estates	Object	<p>OBJECTION is made to the minimum height of 9 metres on COM 2b. There is no justification for the minimum height to be greater than COM 2a. Across COM 2b heights should be reduced below 9m if warranted. If residential development is proposed on COM 2b, this minimum height may restrict the type and form of residential development.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that building in COM 2b (and COM 2a) may have an acoustic function, detailed design and height of buildings would need testing to determine the extent of noise mitigation achievable. The reference to '9m' should be replaced by '6m'</p>	COM2b is visible from Chieftain Way along the access road to the site therefore the building height required is considered valid and appropriate to contain and close the views along the access road and provide maximum screening of the A14 embankment and noise barrier from within Orchard Park and retaining a visual link at the eastern end with Travelodge and existing properties. The purpose of the SPD is to provide general criteria and guidance not to address specific development options. Accordingly all development proposals will be considered on their merits.	The text has been amended to improve clarity.

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

*Plot Com4*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29135 - Unex Holdings Limited	Comment	<p>The text suggests an "active frontage along Chieftan Way" is "essential".</p> <p>The sewerage pumping station has been omitted from drawing 12.</p> <p>On such narrow constrained sites, it is not realistic to suggest that "up to 20% of each plot will be landscaped".</p> <p>The east-west public realm link is not feasible. It would affect the viability of an already narrow site and push the buildings closer to the sewerage pumping station.</p> <p>The building heights are too prescriptive. The existing design guide envisages a four storey commercial building, taller than 12 metres.</p> <p>Undercroft parking is not viable.</p> <p>Vehicular access should be shown at the eastern end.</p>	<p>Correct this error to refer to an active frontage fronting POS3 and Topper Street.</p> <p>Reconsider the proposals in relation to the sewerage pumping station and amend accordingly.</p> <p>The reference for up to 20% of each commercial plot to be landscaped is stated within the Arbury Camp Design Guide (p100) and the SPD was carrying that intention forward. To prevent confusion this statement will be removed. Paragraph 5.26 has been amended to reflect the provision of new open space.</p> <p>The SPD suggests a public realm link between the western end of land parcel COM4 and Plot P. The Arbury Camp Design Guide indicates a building frontage set back from the boundary with land parcel P, which would enable a landscape strip and footpath connection as indicated, without reducing the developable land further.</p> <p>The building heights were set, as a variation from the Arbury Camp Design Guide, in response to advice regarding the current market conditions. The Council is willing to continue to use the original building heights proposed in the Arbury Camp Design Guide.</p> <p>Car parking proposals should be considered for their appropriateness for the development proposals being brought forward; accordingly no particular approach should be ruled in or ruled out but the proposals considered with an open mind. Make reference to the English Partnerships guidance What Works Where; however clarify that the car parking principles in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking on the vacant sites. Add that careful consideration will be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed. The SPD aims to provide direction to approach the design of the vacant sites, for development proposals that will come forward at some time in the future when the market conditions may or may not</p>	<p>The error has been corrected to refer to COM4 fronting onto POS3 and Topper Street.</p> <p>The proposals have been amended in relation to the sewerage pumping station.</p> <p>The reference for up to 20% of each commercial plot to be landscaped has been removed.</p> <p>Amend the proposed building heights to reflect those in the Arbury Camp Design Guide</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>be those currently being experienced.</p> <p>The Arbury Camp Design Guide does not propose a vehicular link to the eastern end of COM4. A vehicular access here was considered but has not been proposed as there are concerns about safety due to the close proximity of such an access to the bend in Topper Street.</p>	
29076 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	<p>The various figures showing the principles for the parcels should be far clearer with more detail including landscaping.</p> <p>A suitable noise study should be undertaken so accurate mapping can be given for each parcel.</p> <p>Better connections with existing developed sites to ensure coherent development should be made.</p>	<p>The figures are intended to illustrate only the key principles for the design of the site that would apply to any development proposal. More detailed direction would only be pertinent to a specific design for a specific use and will vary from scheme to scheme and are therefore not appropriate for inclusion on the figure illustrating the key principles.</p> <p>Developers will be required to undertake an appropriate noise study to direct the design of their proposals as directed in paragraph 4.30. Previous tests have indicated the suitability, in principle, of permitting the alternative land uses on these sites. It is for the developer to demonstrate that the proposals are appropriately designed and address all issues impacting on the design.</p>	<p>The figure title has been amended to state, "Key Design Principles."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29075 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	<p>Specific criteria for air quality and noise levels could be included and aligned to indicators from World Health Organisation and National Air Quality Objectives.</p> <p>Criteria could set out a minimum distance from the carriageway or A14 for buildings.</p> <p>The various figures showing the principles for the parcels should be far clearer with more detail including landscaping.</p> <p>A suitable noise study should be undertaken so accurate mapping can be given for each parcel. Better connections with existing developed sites to ensure coherent development should be made.</p>	<p>Reference is made in Section 4 to the Council's Low emissions strategy. Development proposals will be required to meet those relevant standards.</p> <p>A minimum distance from the A14 embankment for the location of residential properties has been added in paragraph 5.55.</p> <p>The figures are intended to illustrate only the key principles for the design of the site that would apply to any development proposal. More detailed direction would only be pertinent to a specific design for a specific use and will vary from scheme to scheme and are therefore not appropriate for inclusion on the figure illustrating the key principles.</p> <p>Developers will be required to undertake an appropriate noise study to direct the design of their proposals as directed in paragraph 4.30. Previous tests have indicated the suitability, in principle, of permitting the alternative land uses on these sites. It is for the developer to demonstrate that the proposals are appropriately designed and address all issues impacting on the design.</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added to read: 5.55. Residential properties should be located a minimum distance of 25m from the edge of the A14 carriageway.</p> <p>The figure title has been amended to state, "Key Design Principles."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Plot L2</i>				
29136 - Unex Holdings Limited	Comment	<p>There is insufficient development shown on this parcel to make it commercially viable.</p> <p>Undercroft parking is not viable on this site.</p>	<p>The SPD illustrates only the key design principles that the Council wishes to see developers address. Therefore the development indicated is not necessarily the total development that could be on a site. It is for the developer to bring forward development proposals for the site that address these key principles.</p> <p>Car parking proposals should be considered for their appropriateness for the development proposals being brought forward; accordingly no particular approach should be ruled in or ruled out but the proposals considered with an open mind. Make reference to the English Partnerships guidance What Works Where; however clarify that the car parking principles in the Arbury Camp Design Guide should form the foundation of the design for car parking on the vacant sites. Add that careful consideration will be given to assessing the detailed development proposals to ensure they function appropriately for the development proposed. The SPD aims to provide direction to approach the design of the vacant sites, for development proposals that will come forward at some time in the future when the market conditions may or may not be those currently being experienced.</p>	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29077 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	<p>Specific criteria for air quality and noise levels could be included and aligned to indicators from World Health Organisation and National Air Quality Objectives.</p> <p>Criteria could set out a minimum distance from the carriageway or A14 for buildings.</p> <p>Give minimum percentage of landscaping required</p> <p>The various figures showing the principles for the parcels should be far clearer with more detail including landscaping.</p> <p>A suitable noise study should be undertaken so accurate mapping can be given for each parcel.</p> <p>Better connections with existing developed sites to ensure coherent development should be made.</p>	<p>Reference is made in Section 4 to the Council's Low emissions strategy. Development proposals will be required to meet those relevant standards.</p> <p>A minimum distance from the A14 embankment for the location of residential properties has been added in paragraph 5.55.</p> <p>The figures are intended to illustrate only the key principles for the design of the site that would apply to any development proposal. More detailed direction would only be pertinent to a specific design for a specific use and will vary from scheme to scheme and are therefore not appropriate for inclusion on the figure illustrating the key principles.</p> <p>Developers will be required to undertake an appropriate noise study to direct the design of their proposals as directed in paragraph 4.30. Previous tests have indicated the suitability, in principle, of permitting the alternative land uses on these sites. It is for the developer to demonstrate that the proposals are appropriately designed and address all issues impacting on the design.</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added to read: 5.55. Residential properties should be located a minimum distance of 25m from the edge of the A14 carriageway.</p> <p>The figure title has been amended to state, "Key Design Principles."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Plot K1</i>				
29078 - Orchard Park Community Council	Object	<p>Give minimum percentage of landscaping required. Reference should be made to aspirations expressed through design workshops led by SCDC for this site, including levels of sustainability.</p> <p>The various figures showing the principles for the parcels should be far clearer with more detail including landscaping.</p> <p>A suitable noise study should be undertaken so accurate mapping can be given for each parcel. Better connections with existing developed sites to ensure coherent development should be made.</p>	<p>The minimum percentage of public amenity space and landscaping required is in accordance with the Council's adopted policies.</p> <p>The aspirations of the design workshops held in relation to this site are included in the Arbury Camp Design Guide, the principles of which are brought forward into this SPD.</p> <p>The figures are intended to illustrate only the key principles for the design of the site that would apply to any development proposal. More detailed direction would only be pertinent to a specific design for a specific use and will vary from scheme to scheme and are therefore not appropriate for inclusion on the figure illustrating the key principles.</p> <p>Developers will be required to undertake an appropriate noise study to direct the design of their proposals as directed in paragraph 4.30. Previous tests have indicated the suitability, in principle, of permitting the alternative land uses on these sites. It is for the developer to demonstrate that the proposals are appropriately designed and address all issues impacting on the design.</p>	The figure title has been amended to state, "Key Design Principles."
29049 - Cambridge City Council	Object	<p>Cambridge City Council is promoting Plot K1 for enabled co-housing whereby it's preferred option is for homes to be provided in partnership with an established developer. While recognising the need to set key principles for development plots in Orchard Park, there are some concerns that design principles as drafted may restrict the level of ambition that the City Council has for this site, particularly in terms sustainable design and construction. The essential or desirable criteria do not indicate that this development would be a high quality, sustainable and built to the highest possible standards of environmental performance.</p>	<p>Amend the text to clarify that this development should be a high quality development built to the highest possible standards of environmental performance.</p>	The text has been amended to clarify that this development should be a high quality development built to the highest possible standards of environmental performance.