

Chapter 5: Delivering High Quality Places

Policy HQ/1: Design Principles

<p>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 28</p>	<p>Securing High Quality Design</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	<p>South Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD 2010</p>
<p>Existing policies</p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of New Development (DP/2) • Development Criteria (DP/3) • Cumulative Development (DP5)
<p>Analysis</p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning for sustainable development involves replacing poor design with good design. Planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p> <p>At paragraph 58 it states that, ‘Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; • establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit; • optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks; • respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation; • create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and • are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.’ <p>The Local Plan needs to establish design principles that new development will be expected to adhere to. The principles established in the policy option have been guided by the NPPF, the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter, and the District Design Guide.</p>

	<p>They are intended to encompass the range of issues that could affect sites of any scale, although their applicability will vary between site, use and location.</p> <p>The District Design Guide Design SPD expands on district-wide policies, and policies in individual Area Action Plans for major developments that may vary from the district-wide policies. It provides additional details on how they will be implemented. It sets out important design principles based on recognised good practice and explains key requirements of the District Council that will be taken into account when considering planning proposals.</p> <p>A further issue identified is whether specific guidance should be provided on the design and width of streets. This could address street character in terms of verges, tree planting, pavements, and sustainable drainage systems.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: None. A policy seeking high quality design is necessary to reflect the NPPF and to support delivery of sustainable development. However, there are a range of approaches regarding how this is delivered, including through the district design guide, or more local guidance.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 28: A: Have the right design principles been identified to achieve high quality design in all new developments? B: Should the Local Plan provide guidance on design of streets to improve the public realm, including minimum street widths and street trees?</p>

	<p>C: Do you think the Council should retain and update the District Design Guide?</p> <p>D: Would you like your village to produce its own design guide? If so, please let us know which village so that we can discuss how to take this forward with the local Parish Council.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Option A proposes the inclusion of comprehensive policies to set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area, and that development must be of high quality design and make a positive contribution to its local and wider surroundings. It includes seven design principles. Principles address a wide range of issues with the overall aim of achieving good design, but good design has implications for delivery of most of the sustainability objectives. Given the scale of development proposed, impacts of such a policy could be significant. Wider economic benefits have been noted, as a high quality environment can contribute to economic development, contributing to what makes the area special. The contribution to human health objective is also notable, with the support of the Health Impact Assessment process to aid its implementation. Ensuring environments are accessible to all will support delivery of the redressing inequalities objective. The delivery, and the significance of the impact, will depend on site specific implementation, but there are potential significance positive impacts for a range of objectives.</p> <p>Option B seeks views on whether the Local Plan provides guidance on design of streets to improve the public realm, including minimum street widths and street trees. This has the potential to support the landscape and townscape objective, and the creation of good spaces that work well. It could impact on density, and therefore the amount of land to deliver the level of development selected, although the scale of impact is uncertain, as it would depend on site specific implementation through the design process. The planting of trees could support biodiversity. It could also create areas of shade, which could aid adaptation to climate change.</p> <p>Option C seeks views on the District Design Guide. This has the potential to support achievement of good design and the benefits identified by option A.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Question 28:</p> <p>A: Support: 37, Object: 1, Comment: 19</p> <p>B: Support: 27, Object: 5, Comment: 13</p> <p>C: Support: 35, Object: 2, Comment: 12</p> <p>D: Support: 15, Object: 4, Comment: 16</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Question 28A:</p>

SUPPORT:

- Support aspirations - good design should be insisted upon for all development, with poor designs rejected.

OBJECTIONS:

- Expect strong, locally-specific design policies to ensure developments fit in with their surroundings - city fringe, new settlement, rural village. (Cambridge City Council)

COMMENTS:

- Not just about appearance but also utility and a balance needs to be struck to ensure viability of development.
- Take care not to be too prescriptive.
- Respond to local character and history, and reinforce local distinctiveness (English Heritage).
- Address width of roads and unsafe on-street parking.
- New developments do not convey an impression of quality, or sympathetic integration. Higher densities do not work - leads to problems of noise, environment and parking problems.

Question 28B:**SUPPORT:**

- Streets need to be wide (specify minimum width) and inviting, not cluttered with signage, street furniture and parked cars - prevents congestion and creates a more pleasant environment with greenery and trees to soften appearance of building facades.

COMMENTS:

- Do not specify minimum width - assess on a case by case basis taking into account different function and requirements.
- Inhibit movement of cars in housing areas and have a practical network of footpaths and cycleways separate from cars, or provision of multi-use surfaces.
- Guidance on street design should be included in Design Guide not Local Plan policy.
- Linked to car parking provision – cars need to be accommodated on plot and/or roads suitable width and design to accommodate parked cars safely.

Question 28C:**SUPPORT:**

- Retain Design Guide and update it from time to time as lessons are learned.
- Provides useful guidance to developers. Without it designs will be experimental.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to take account of variation of village character, avoid one size fits all, update periodically to include what is learnt from successes and errors! • Include impacts of traffic management, parking, street safety, environmental issues etc. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be created by the village or settlement area. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of streets should be incorporated into Design Guide rather than in new policy. • Needs a good editor to produce a more readable and useful document. • Needs updating to take account more modern aspects of design / thinking – moving subject needs regular updating to remain valid. <p>Question 28D: There were several expressions of interest, mostly from Parish Councils, to prepare their own design guidance, possibly incorporated into other village plans.</p>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a criteria-based policy outlining the design principles to be addressed in all new developments, including those consulted on in Question 28A and incorporating guidance on improving the public realm (Question 28B).</p> <p>There was strong support for the design principles and for addressing public realm issues, but mixed views on whether the policy should specify minimum street widths, with concerns raised that this could be too prescriptive. An objection suggested strong, locally-specific design policies were needed to ensure developments fit in with their surroundings.</p> <p>The design principles avoid being overly prescriptive and can be applied to development in any location, negating the need for more than one policy for specific surroundings. In reviewing the policy, greater emphasis has been placed on responding to local character and reinforcing local distinctiveness to secure a more place-responsive design from developers, and addressing public realm issues, in response to comments received.</p> <p>The District Design Guide will be updated and revised in due course, following adoption of the new Local Plan, taking on board comments about making the document more focused and user-friendly. Whether villages are interested in preparing their own design guides is not something for the Local Plan.</p>
Policy included in	Policy HQ/1: Design Principles

the draft Local Plan?	
Policy HQ/1: Design Principles (and paragraphs 5.1 – 5.9)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 33 Support: 17 (including 2 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 16 (including 2 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Support this policy. • Fulbourn PC – Support as protects intrinsic character of the village and surrounding countryside. • Great Abington PC – Fully support. Completely in harmony with our ambitions for developments in Great Abington. • Natural England – Pleased includes reference to high quality landscaping and public spaces with various functions. • Every new development must make the site and its environment, as well as the surrounding area, better to live in. • Proposals will help create good quality new developments. • New developments should be attractive and traditional to be in keeping with rural village settings. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council - Strengthen to ensure needs of ageing population addressed by future development and provide for supported living and other facilities to meet adult social care needs. Suggest Building for Life standards. • Caldecote & Cambourne PCs – Should include reference to the requirement for Lifetime Homes in Criterion k. • English Heritage – Welcome policy subject to minor change to criteria 1b and 1e, and paragraph 5.6 to strengthen policy in relation to heritage assets and improve clarity. • Swavesey and District Bridleways Association and 6 others - Criterion f - add horse riding. • Much concern with conserving. Should be greater acceptance of new ways of doing things. Criteria c, d and e contradict. • Policy needs more emphasis on the positive contribution high quality design can have on vibrant communities. • Sad to see how badly made new developments around Cambridge are. Not in keeping / unattractive.
Assessment	Policy based on policies from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, found sound through the examination. Policy HQ/1 outlines a number of criteria to ensure high quality development which meets the needs of everyone, including those with particular needs - criteria j and k ensure flexibility that allows for future

	<p>changes in needs and lifestyles of the whole community. As it relates to all new development, not just residential, it is not appropriate to include reference to Lifetime Homes - addressed in Policy H/8: Housing Mix.</p> <p>Whilst the Building for Life standard is a useful tool for gaining an indication of the quality of new developments, it has certain limitations that may not give a true impression of the quality of the scheme. This is because the scoring system is not a sophisticated tool and can potentially score schemes down where evidence is not available at the time of the assessment. Therefore it should not be relied upon as a measure of good quality design, although it is used as an indicator of the quality of new development through the Annual Monitoring Report.</p> <p>The recently introduced BREEAM Communities assessment provides another helpful means of assessing the sustainability of new developments, and could appropriately be used by developers to help them with their sustainability statements, particularly for large developments. A change is also proposed to the supporting text to Policies HQ/1 and CC/1 to recommend the use of the BREEAM Communities assessment.</p> <p>It is important to preserve and enhance aspects of the built and natural environment, but this can be achieved in a number of ways and the policy allows flexibility that should not stifle innovative new approaches. Criteria c, d and e complement each other, seeking to ensure development that is place-responsive, respects its surroundings and is compatible with its location.</p> <p>Minor changes are proposed in response to representations from English Heritage in relation to heritage assets; from Swavesey and District Bridleways Association to include reference to horse riding; and a change to highlight the importance of good design on the vibrancy of communities. Additional guidance is to be added to paragraph 5.9, in response to representations made to Policy CC/6 in Chapter 4.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend last sentence of paragraph 5.2 to read: ‘...whilst using the opportunities presented by development to enhance the built and natural environment, <u>and create vibrant communities.</u>’</p> <p>Amend criterion 1b to read: ‘Conserve or enhance important natural and historic assets of the</p>

site **and their setting**;

Amend criterion 1e to read:

‘...interesting vistas, skylines, focal points and **appropriately scaled** landmarks along routes and around spaces;’

Amend Criterion 1f to read:

‘...conveniently accessible ~~streets~~ **routes** both within the development...delivering attractive and safe opportunities for walking, cycling, **horse riding** and public transport;’

Amend last sentence of paragraph 5.6 to read:

‘...whilst protecting and enhancing the natural **and historic** environment, and conserving the countryside...’

Add the following text to the end of paragraph 5.6:

‘Applicants will be required to demonstrate how their proposals meet the principles of sustainability, by submitting a Sustainability Statement, under policy CC/1 in Chapter 4 Climate Change.’

Amend last sentence of paragraph 5.9:

‘~~and~~ Car parking what works where (English Partnerships); **and RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2012).**’

Add a new paragraph after paragraph 4.11 to read:

‘The policy requires applicants to submit a Sustainability Statement to demonstrate how the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation have been embedded within the development proposal. The Council would recommend that in the case of larger-scale developments (100 or more dwellings or exceeding 5,000m² of other floorspace) that a BREEAM Communities assessment is undertaken as part of demonstrating how they have integrated sustainable design into the masterplanning process.’

Add to the list of documents in Appendix A:

RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2012)

Policy HQ/2: Public Art

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 29	Public Art
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts and Culture Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2006) • Arts and Cultural Strategy (the Arts Forum for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough 2007) • South Cambridgeshire Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (2009)
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Public Art (SF/6)
Analysis	<p>The District Council has an existing policy that encourages developers to allocate a proportion of the budget for the implementation of a carefully considered public art scheme. The policy is applied to residential developments comprising 10 or more dwellings, or other developments where the floorspace to be built is 1000m² gross or more, including office, manufacturing, warehousing and retail developments. On smaller developments encouragement should be given to developers to include Public Art within their scheme as a means of enhancing the quality of their development. The supporting text of the policy provides a guide figure of between 1% and 5% of the associated construction costs of a capital project.</p> <p>The public art policy was identified as a notable asset for generating commissions in the Arts and Cultural Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region.</p> <p>The benefits of Public Art relate to social, economic, environmental and cultural factors. Public Art can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively contribute to integrating village groups and neighbourhoods, promoting community cohesion through socially engaged arts activity. • Create unique images that, as symbols, can be used to promote places, generating pride of place and a sense of local identity and distinctiveness. • Enhance the fundamental principles of urban design, to better improve the quality of the built environment and create distinction and character. <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: There are general options regarding the approach to public art, and the form public art could take within developments.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.

Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 29: What approach do you think the Local Plan should take on public art?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	The existing policy has secured public art for a range of developments, contributing to objective of improving spaces and the built environment. The issue largely seeks views on the form public art should take.
Representations Received	Support: 9, Object: 5, Comment: 34
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include as part of design principles so developments are designed with bespoke functional elements such as lighting, seating and water features, or integrate practical features into buildings and landscape, to provide individuality and sense of place. • Should not be imposed or prescriptive of the form it takes, should be in keeping with local sensibilities and acceptable to local community - provide spaces to facilitate local people to do what they want and let parish councils spend S106 monies. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be seen as wasteful (better use of money) and annoying. • Likely to fail tests Regulation 122 of Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and cannot be required by Planning Condition. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public art is more likely to be delivered if there is a separate policy. • Consider 'art' in the widest sense, including non-durable and performing art, used to build communities in new developments - successful at Orchard Park. • Continue to encourage not require, and no more than 1% (consider viability).
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy encouraging the provision of public art which allows for greater flexibility in terms of allowing art in a wider sense, but also requires more local involvement in the decision-making process.</p> <p>There was a mixed response with broad support for public art, including wanting functional elements within developments, to provide individuality and improve the quality of places. But others saw it as a waste of money and something that cannot be required. It was also suggested that there needed to be more local involvement in deciding what was appropriate and for the inclusion of public art in a wider sense, including performing arts.</p> <p>The public art policy only encourages provision of public art as a</p>

	means of enhancing the quality of development. In reviewing the policy greater emphasis is given to local involvement in the decision-making process, including having regard to the local circumstances of the site and/or local aspirations, in response to comments received.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy HQ/2: Public Art and New Development
Policy HQ/2: Public Art and New Development (paragraphs 5.10 - 5.13)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 11 Support: 6 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 5 (including 2 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn PC – Support policy - led to major public art projects being incorporated into developments – e.g. The Swifts. • Think about public art in widest form, not just installations and street art – e.g. funding a workshop, project or performance. • Community must be seen in widest sense not just council and school. Vital that it is ‘owned’ by the community. • Use should be made of design competitions and allow local people to choose from wide variety of types and styles. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote & Cambourne PCs – Policy should foster local artists in conjunction with community and where possible be integrated into buildings, landscape or street furniture. Essential to strengthen community buy in and ‘ownership’. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Agree in principle as highly desirable, but should allow pooling of funds from small developments to deliver fewer more significant pieces. • Criterion 3 – Unsure if this just relates to art as in sculptures and material installations.
Assessment	<p>The policy has been largely carried forward from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The policy is flexible to allow pooling of monies from smaller schemes towards larger projects. The Public Art Supplementary Planning Document outlines where a developer is willing to make a contribution but unable to achieve an appropriate scheme on site the Council will encourage financial contributions.</p> <p>Criterion 2 requires local involvement and allows projects to be community-led, which should develop local ‘buy-in’ and</p>

	<p>'ownership' and provides flexibility for communities to choose an appropriate project - it would be up to them whether they foster local artists. Local involvement should also include the local Parish Councils. Therefore, for clarity, the policy should be amended to include the relevant Parish Council.</p> <p>Criterion 3 applies equally to material installations and wider performing arts.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor Change</p> <p>Amend Policy HQ/2 criterion 2 to read: "The provision of public art must involve <u>the relevant Parish Council and</u> the local community and could be..."</p>