

**CHAPTER 11: Promoting Successful Communities**

<b>QUESTION NO.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF REPS</b>
<b>QUESTION 80:Health Impact Assessment</b>	
<p>A: Should the Local Plan continue to seek Health Impact Assessments (HIA) to accompany major development proposals?</p> <p>Support:28 Object: 0 Comment: 2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should not have a negative impact on a village</li> <li>• Support from 17 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Assessment essential even for 20 dwellings.</li> <li>• Health and wellbeing issues are key for people to living long and quality lives.</li> <li>• NHS Cambridgeshire support policy</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HIAs relevant to large developments but not for smaller ones</li> </ul>
<p>B: Should the threshold when HIA are required</p> <p>i Remain at 20 or more dwellings or 1,000m<sup>2</sup> floorspace</p> <p>Support: 19 Object: 2 Comment: 2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support including 15 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Developments always need to consider the wellbeing of residents</li> <li>• Any impact however small needs to be assessed.</li> <li>• Yes - for small developments located on known contaminated land or adjacent to polluting sites or roads</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NHS Cambridgeshire states that full HIA may not be practical for such small developments where most significant impacts may be in construction phase. Suggests alternative 'Rapid Impact Assessment' - less intensive but could identify if further assessment needed.</li> <li>• HIA irrelevant in smaller developments. Threshold should be 150 dwellings or more</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambourne Parish Council:</b> is the approach to be taken</li> </ul>
<p>B: Should the threshold when HIA are required</p> <p>ii Be raised to 100 or more dwellings, or 5000m<sup>2</sup> floorspace</p> <p>Support: 10 Object: 2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support including 3 Parish Councils</li> <li>• For HIA to be worthwhile should only be on major developments. HIA for smaller sites do not add to robust planning application submission.</li> <li>• Threshold for EIA is 200 dwellings - make sense to be in line.</li> <li>• Could have exceptions for smaller developments located on known contaminated land or adjacent to polluting sites or roads</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seems sensible to have HIA for smaller sites</li> <li>• Raise threshold to 150 dwellings because HIA irrelevant on smaller developments.</li> </ul>
Please provide comments	<b>COMMENTS:</b>

<p>Comment: 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remain at 20 or more unless this puts a burden on planning system.</li> <li>• Must be adequate community facilities in countryside for indoor and outdoor active recreation.</li> <li>• Existing pressures on Cambridgeshire’s existing facilities – does HIA correctly predict requirements of population?</li> <li>• NHS Cambridgeshire – Timely to review HIA SPD. New toolkits available for assessment work</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 81: Protecting Village Services and Facilities</b></p>	
<p>A: Should the Local Plan seek to continue to protect where possible local services and facilities such as village shops, pubs, post offices, libraries, community meeting places, health centres or leisure facilities?</p> <p>Support: 69 Comment: 5</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village high street is important part of character of village (Fulbourn)</li> <li>• Support from 27 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• Local post office has many roles – meeting place; advice centre; bank – gives life to village. Once gone likely not to be replaced. Village then loses its sense of community and just becomes a collection of houses.</li> <li>• Without local facilities people have to use their cars resulting in increased road traffic. Cuts in funding to buses and some households not having access to a car creates isolation especially for elderly. Need local services to be protected</li> <li>• Policy should be aware of additional costs and should not seek to impose undue cost burden on development.</li> <li>• Council should not put onerous conditions on owners of these facilities when they need to be marketed. Should not control price they are marketed.</li> <li>• Support but if services do not have funding, make profit or underused they are unlikely to survive</li> <li>• Should link policy to Business Rates so lower rate from small local independent shops.</li> <li>• Need to protect local services for those with limited mobility. Shop/ pub are important meeting places so people do not feel isolated within community.</li> <li>• Ageing population will need access to services – local plan must meet their needs</li> <li>• Need to create community asset register as part of policy</li> <li>• Should promote Farmers markets selling local produce</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council – South Cambs residents rely on Cambridge for access to high order services and facilities. South Cambs residents need to have range of services within a sustainable distance of their homes to allow access by non-car modes of transport. As city</li> </ul>

	<p>grows, challenge will be for historic and tightly constrained City Centre to cope with the increasing numbers of people, and to accommodate the range of services and businesses that want to locate here - an issue for City Council. Will need to work together with SCDC as part of the wider joined-up approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge Past, Present and Future – NPPF protects former pubs from redevelopment. Need to apply stringent tests to establish viability of pub so not lost to community. Need to consider co-location of local facilities</li> <li>• To maintain local facilities need to have sufficient population in a village – therefore need to allow small scale residential allocations to provide critical mass. Growth essential to maintain local services.</li> </ul>
<p>B: Are there any other services and facilities that should be included?</p> <p>Support: 4 Object: 1 Comment: 26</p>	<p><b>SUGGESTED OTHER SERVICES/ FACILITES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCDC should be sensitive to local needs</li> <li>• Suggestions from 16 parish councils</li> <li>• If village does not have specific service may need to consider how it may be provided</li> <li>• Community transport</li> <li>• 'Service station' for visiting boaters (e.g. shower block, washing machines, sanitary disposal, electric hook-up ). - Conservators of River Cam</li> <li>• Parks, community gardens, children's play areas, allotments, village green's</li> <li>• Youth centres or other facilities for youth groups</li> <li>• Religious establishments</li> <li>• Schools</li> <li>• Bank / cash points – accessible not just when shop/ pub open</li> <li>• Community cafes</li> <li>• Bus services / Bus stops, bus shelters</li> <li>• Post box</li> <li>• NHS dental practices</li> <li>• Cultural and arts venues</li> <li>• Prescription delivery service</li> <li>• Residential and nursing care homes</li> <li>• Children's homes</li> <li>• County Council would like to see establishment of community hubs where service provision combined –could underpin viability and achieve efficiencies for range of local community services by sharing accommodation and other resources.</li> <li>• Caldecote residents would like to see overall improved facilities</li> </ul>
<p>C: Should the Local Plan include the alternative more detailed and stringent tests proposed in Issue 81 for determining when an</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Councils should be consulted for local context</li> <li>• Support from 14 parish councils.</li> <li>• Places of worship used by community for different</li> </ul>

<p>alternative use should be permitted?</p> <p>Support: 27 Object: 5 Comment: 4</p>	<p>activities and if it is put to another use this is lost</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If facility is last of its kind in village community should be offered support and time to make alternative arrangements for preservation of service by community/ other party.</li> <li>• Support tests because would give community change to have their views taken into account.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County Council question whether alternative test is applicable to all local services. For library service better to do community impact assessment.</li> <li>• Facility must have value in use to remain viable. Growth in population is essential to maintain local services. Policy restrictions do not ensure business will survive but could result in derelict village centres- if cannot find alternative use building may remain empty. Retain existing criteria.</li> <li>• Council should not put onerous conditions on owners of these facilities when they need to be marketed. – should not interfere with price to be marketed.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tests should not be detrimental to owner of business – 12 months of a failing business that must be put on market to meet criteria is not good idea</li> <li>• Marketing facility for 12months not long enough in current economic climate. Once facility is gone it is less likely to return.</li> </ul>
<p>D: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?</p> <p>Comment: 4 Representations: 4</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local services and facilities must be maintained. A local needs survey would be useful to see what residents want</li> <li>• Important distinction between commercial enterprise and non-profit making venue like village community shop</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 82: Developing New Communities</b></p>	
<p>A: Do you agree with the principles of service provision in Issue 82?</p> <p>Support: 30 Object: 1 Comment: 4</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to plan for facilities in new developments</li> <li>• Developers aware of need for provision</li> <li>• Support from 12 parish councils</li> <li>• Policy should follow general guidance laid down by NPPF</li> <li>• Need timely provision of facilities especially health, retail and transport</li> <li>• S Cambs District Council experienced in creating new communities</li> <li>• Natural England want policy to ensure non-vehicular access is promoted for people to access services including Green Infrastructure. GI should be requirement of new development as identified</li> </ul>

	<p>in Cambridgeshire GI Strategy.</p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy restrictions do not ensure businesses survive or are created. Need growth in population to ensure facilities are used and retained</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If families move into an area need more sports centres / green spaces for team sports/ playgrounds for children and youth centres</li> <li>• Cambridgeshire County Council comments that need to define term 'Community Services' in Local Plan. Should include library service and Household Recycling Centres...Provision of these to be included in CIL.</li> <li>• Little confidence from experience of past that District Council will provide adequate services for new communities. Major developments in an area impact adversely on quality of life of existing residents.</li> <li>• Need to include existing residents in community development</li> </ul>
<p>B: If not, why not? What alternative issues do you think should be included?</p> <p>Comment: 3</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of community facilities fosters community spirit therefore should be provided at earliest opportunity</li> <li>• New communities should be parished at beginning of new settlement</li> <li>• Should provide burial grounds in new developments</li> <li>• Needs of different groups must be considered in provision of services.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 83: Provision for Sub Regional Sporting, Cultural and Community Facilities</b></p>	
<p>A: Is there a need for any other sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities that should be considered through the Local Plan review?</p> <p>Support:14 Object: 8 Comment: 18</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge region is under served for sporting facilities. Need for multi-purpose sporting facility. Benefit health and well-being of local populace and would be boost to local sports teams</li> <li>• Support need for extra facilities</li> <li>• 3 Parish councils support</li> <li>• Need for space for team sport to encourage healthy lifestyle and contribute to Olympic legacy</li> <li>• Needs to be driven by major well known sporting club so more impressive facility to encourage involvement in sport.</li> <li>• Need facilities for range of sports including hockey</li> <li>• Need to work with Cambridge City since sub regional facilities</li> <li>• Need review of existing facilities and see where gap</li> <li>• Not enough astro turf facilities to meet demand</li> </ul>

	<p>from sports clubs in Cambridge</p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not needed</li> <li>• South Cambs is not a place for sub-regional centre of any description. Not in keeping with character. Does not have the transport infrastructure. Local people do not want football stadium. Developers dictating land use.</li> <li>• 3 Parish Councils object</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mention of policing requirements and 20 year plan should allow for that</li> <li>• Need to take account of parking and public transport issues and impact on adjoining residents</li> <li>• More demand for children's play areas in villages</li> <li>• Need for policy to both protect existing facilities from development pressures and to provide new or enhanced facilities wherever possible</li> <li>• Need to define clearly 'community facilities'</li> <li>• Trumpington Residents Association would support SCDC and City Council if they decide to investigate options for community stadium and concert hall</li> </ul>
<p><b>B:</b> If there is a need, what type and size of facility should they be?</p> <p>Support: 9  Comment: 10  Representations:17</p>	<p><b>SUGGESTED TYPE AND SIZE OF FACILITY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Horizon's Arts and Cultural Strategy for Cambridge Sub-Region 2006 proposed new major conference venue within vicinity of Cambridge – on edge of city to take pressure off historic city centre. Could include Concert Hall which would need easy access to range of hotel accommodation</li> <li>• Horizon's Report 2006 identified gap in sports provision within Cambridge Sub-Region – need for community sports centre and base for Cambridge United</li> <li>• Stadium with space for up to 10,000 crowd with supporting infrastructure and wide range of pitches and facilities to enable groups to get involved</li> <li>• New Crematorium will be needed within plan period</li> <li>• Support for relocation of Cambridge City FC to Sawston</li> <li>• Marina</li> <li>• BMX arena – Cambourne or Northstowe?</li> <li>• Swimming pools</li> <li>• Astro turf facility for hockey and tennis</li> <li>• CamToo Project - City Local Plan already recognises this project which crosses the City / South Cambs boundary and so should be included in South Cambs Local Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This should be identified at village level by village</li> </ul>

	<p>plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size depends on facility. Unless a benefactor or investor turns up the developer of such a facility will probably want to build other property to pay for it.</li> <li>• Assuming every community of 2.5K-10K needs playing fields (soccer etc)/tennis courts/community hall/changing rooms/other exercise areas</li> </ul>
<p><b>C:</b> If there is a need, where is the most appropriate location?</p> <p>Support: 6 Comment: 12 Representations:18</p>	<p><b>MOST APPROPRIATE LOCATION?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the fringes of the city, the northern fringe or in the south, adjacent to the M11, at Trumpington.</li> <li>• Anywhere near a park and ride site</li> <li>• Such facilities should be considered in Northstowe and any other new settlements included in future policy.</li> <li>• This should be identified at village level by village plans.</li> <li>• As there is no need in South Cambs, but appears to be demand from the city / developers, the developers should find a suitable location within the city.</li> <li>• If there is a need for a stadium, it should be sited amongst the population it is intended to serve - in heart of that population (as the Abbey Road Stadium is) so that users of the stadium can walk to it. Siting it away from the population it is intended to serve scores an own goal in terms of worsening Cambridge's already badly stretched transportation system.</li> <li>• Barracks land at Waterbeach provides a great opportunity for a new leisure area using existing facilities and adding new</li> <li>• Union Place proposal to north of Cambridge includes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A community stadium with a 10,000 seat capacity;</li> <li>▪ A concert hall;</li> <li>▪ A ice-rink;</li> <li>▪ A large and high quality conference centre and an adjoining extended hotel.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Accessible to as many residents and visitors as possible with ample parking and good public transport – Trumpington good location / not good location.</li> <li>• Stadium to be within walking distance of Cambridge Science Park</li> <li>• Site with good cycling links</li> <li>• Chesterton Fen (site previously designated under the Cambs and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan as a reprocessing plant).</li> <li>• Consider sites at Waterbeach, part of the Marshalls Airport site and the University site at Madingley Road could all be usefully explored.</li> <li>• Suggest look at using/converting grounds (eg</li> </ul>

	<p>Barton)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indoor swimming pool – Cambourne?</li> <li>• Swimming pool - Cambridge West site, at Northstowe or in an existing large village?</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 84: Community Stadium</b></p>	
<p><b>A:</b> Is there a need for a community stadium?</p> <p>Support:117 Object: 13 Comment: 16</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area needs a first class stadium and sporting facilities that can benefit everyone.</li> <li>• PMP 2006 report for Cambridge Horizons identified a gap in sports provision within Cambridge Sub-Region.</li> <li>• plans to build hockey pitches would be hugely beneficial</li> <li>• This facility will ensure that a positive community spirit will be created, allowing not only residents but local families to come together.</li> <li>• Encourage participation and help the general status of Cambridge sport.</li> <li>• The bulk of the sports provision in the area is largely limited to University students and those at private schools with limited opportunities for local clubs and individuals to access these facilities.</li> <li>• Shortage of readily accessible high quality sporting facilities in Cambridge, particularly astroturf pitches and other sports venues/club house for community use.</li> <li>• Would provide employment.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• not fair that the majority of us who have no interest in football</li> <li>• the only reason the club can have for moving is to appease the developers who own the current site.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be in Northstowe</li> <li>• Better use could be made of the Abbey, which is within cycling distance of a large number of people</li> <li>• New community stadium should include adequate facilities for active participation in sports and physical recreation by public and not simply be venue for spectator sports.</li> <li>• The Trumpington Residents' Association hopes that a new study will be commissioned by the Councils, to look again at the need for and viability of a community stadium in the context of the new Local Plans.</li> </ul>
<p><b>B:</b> If there is a need, what type and size of facility should it be, and where is the most appropriate location?</p> <p>Support:75</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be within cycling distance of City Centre</li> <li>• Support for Trumpington Meadows site (54 representations): Good transport links; would not clog local streets; ability to support the growing local community; no other suitable sites.</li> </ul>

<p>Object: 19 Comment: 19</p>	<p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to Trumpington Meadows (20 representations): Green Belt, Traffic congestion, park and ride full on match days, fan base not local to area, unsustainable location; light and noise pollution; should be within Cambridge</li> <li>• Not in A14 corridor</li> <li>• <b>COMMENTS:</b></li> <li>• Should be sited amongst the population it is intended to serve</li> <li>• Test Trumpington versus Cowley Road and other sites.</li> <li>• Broad location 4 not appropriate</li> <li>• Northstowe / Waterbeach Barracks</li> <li>• North of Cambridge – ‘Union Place’; Cambridge Northern Fringe East</li> <li>• Type of proposal should be based on findings of PMP.</li> <li>• Need for Hockey and football facilities</li> <li>• Athletics facilities</li> <li>• Faxilities to support Youth Sporting Trust</li> <li>• Should have range of other facilities e.g conference, restaurant, entertainment, facilities to support complimentary community projects</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 85: Ice Rink</b></p>	
<p><b>A:</b> Is there a need for an ice rink in or near to Cambridge?</p> <p>Support:23 Object: 7 Comment: 12</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need demonstrated by Cambridgeshire Horizons study</li> <li>• An additional recreation resource</li> <li>• Nearest rink is 40 miles away</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suspect population not large enough to justify</li> <li>• Should be in the City</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is land too valuable?</li> <li>• A policy should only be included if there is any realistic possibility of funding for an ice-rink coming forward.</li> <li>• Waste of Money</li> </ul>
<p><b>B:</b> If there is a need, where should it be located?</p> <p>Support:12 Object: 0 Comment: 5</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edge of City location</li> <li>• North of the A14 – ‘Union Place’</li> <li>• Near Trumpington Meadows</li> <li>• Rowing lake at Waterbeach</li> <li>• Where A11 / M11 splits</li> <li>• NIAB or Clay Farm</li> <li>• Sustainable transport should be a key consideration</li> <li>• Anywhere where land is available and a commercial business case can be made</li> </ul>

<b>QUESTION 86: Concert Hall</b>	
<p><b>A:</b> Is there a need for a concert hall in or near to Cambridge?</p> <p>Support:10 Object: 14 Comment: 8</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No where in Cambridge can support large productions</li> <li>Support any provision for the arts</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No, Cambridge has many facilities;</li> <li>Question whether it is viable</li> <li>Already have Corn Exchange and others</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could also meet need for conference venue</li> <li>Would welcome research into the need</li> <li></li> </ul>
<p><b>B:</b> If there is a need, where should it be located?</p> <p>Support:9 Object: 1 Comment: 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within the City</li> <li>Bourn airfield, Northstowe</li> <li>Off Madingley Road</li> <li>Northstowe or larger village</li> <li>Near new railway station</li> <li>North of the A14 – ‘Union Place’</li> <li>Not Trumpington Meadows</li> <li>Should seek to minimise travel by car</li> </ul>
<b>QUESTION 87: Open Space</b>	
<p><b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan continue to include a policy for open space provision?</p> <p>Support:54 Object: 5 Comment: 3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy should reflect character of surrounding area</li> <li>Vital for development of children and adults</li> <li>Need more open space</li> <li>Support from 23 parish councils</li> <li>Preference for higher standard than exists in the current development plan.</li> <li>Residential gardens are small so need open space</li> <li>Need to include minimum space and quality standard for new housing including garden standard</li> <li>Need to analyse areas deficient in open space and whether significant number of children – overcrowding of open space</li> <li>Public space should be allocated where need by public rather than spare land that developer could not use</li> <li>Small areas within estates (other than LEAPs) should be avoided as they do not provide much scope for informal play, expensive to maintain and can cause friction with neighbours.</li> <li>Any play space within built up areas should be carefully designed/located to minimise disruption to residents.</li> <li>Should allow for areas as yet unused in new developments to be maintained to a good play area / recreational use standard.</li> <li>For smaller developments that do not justify on-site provision, the local authority should develop</li> </ul>

	<p>appropriate criteria for calculating contributions towards off-site provision, including future management and maintenance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision within local plan is based upon 5 acre standard which has been used throughout the country and is therefore widely accepted. SCDC should continue to use this standard as it accepted by developers. To increase the standard would place additional pressures on viability of developments, which would run counter to the current messages coming from Central Government.</li> <li>• Allocation of open space land must be suitable for play and enjoyment, not just a verge of grass along a curb. Land must be quality not just quantity.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although open spaces should be multifunctional, certain uses do not mix well. Need clear masterplanning to avoid conflicts, e.g. wildlife sites and football pitches do not work together, nor tranquil spaces and busy commuter routes such as cycle / bus tracks.</li> <li>• Many development sites are small so unlikely to deliver open space on site. Lack of land means delivering open space from S106 difficult for developer. To avoid this Local Plan should make provision for additional open space facilities – e.g. Cambridge Sport Village.</li> </ul>
<p><b>B:</b> Do you agree with the standards of provision listed in Issue 87 that is similar to the current policy?</p> <p>Support:27 Object: 2 Comment: 10</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standards too restrictive. Formal recreation use such as a community orchard should not be precluded.</li> <li>• Standard adequate but too many developments offset provision of open space to off-site – practice must stop</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Double provision – existing basic standard too small</li> <li>• Should increase standards – existing not sufficient</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to push developers to provide maximum play space/greenery for children and adults if intend to build sustainable housing</li> <li>• Access to open space significant benefit for community health and wellbeing. Contributes to uniqueness of local area and has economic benefit.</li> <li>• Need large green spaces for team sports.</li> <li>• Get the developers to build safe and well-equipped playgrounds for children.</li> <li>• How do I as layman know what standards mean or</li> </ul>

	<p>how they are applied? Too little open space provision at the expense of profit do increase by additional 50% to start with.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positioning and design of all open space should take into account the needs of older people.</li> <li>• Facilities should be shared between villages to minimise running costs</li> </ul>
<p><b>C:</b> If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p> <p>Comment: 18</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS / ALTERNATIVE APPROACH?:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision should be made for the provision of burial grounds within new developments including a space standard.</li> <li>• Policy is too prescriptive and does not account for nearby or informal spaces</li> <li>• Expand the scope of the Sport category to include "Sport, recreation, leisure and community use"</li> <li>• Open space provision figure should be higher (1ha per 1000 people) as previous targets for local nature reserve provision. Open space should be biodiversity rich and appropriate to the location.</li> <li>• New developments and smaller villages often lack access to open space and even to countryside. Availability of nearby public rights of way is uneven (E.g. Great Shelford has few means of access on foot to the neighbouring countryside). The open space standards could be higher for these communities.</li> <li>• Adequate Open Space is important in new developments but this should be considered in light of developments impact on surrounding area.</li> <li>• Where there is already adequate provision close to a new development it may be unnecessary to provide more. Leave it to Parish Councils to decide whether provision of more space is needed and if not whether a contribution to more play equipment would be a better idea.</li> <li>• May impact on viability of development to provide open space – needs discretion if want more housing</li> <li>• Repairs and maintenance are expensive, if each village was responsible for one facility it would spread the load</li> </ul>
<b>QUESTION 88: Allotments</b>	
<p><b>A:</b> Should major new housing developments include provision of allotments?</p> <p>Support:55 Object: 2 Comment: 4</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision should be agreed as part of initial planning applications</li> <li>• Should be considered in consultation with Parish Council</li> <li>• 24 Parishes support policy</li> <li>• SCDC and Cambridge City Council have successfully negotiated allotment provision within urban extensions</li> <li>• Many people would prefer larger garden to a large allotment plot</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As average size of garden decreases so increased demand for allotments.</li> <li>• Smaller allotments may be preferred</li> <li>• Allotments encourage a sense of community</li> <li>• Provision of allotments should be made for good of village as well as the new development. Their siting may obstruct development.</li> <li>• Legal obligation to provide</li> <li>• Existing facilities should be made financially secure before creating new allotments. Managing and maintenance expensive so need to consider this in S106 agreements or CIL.</li> <li>• Should be provision for vacant allotment land to be maintained until occupied.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to policy</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No definition given for an allotment therefore cannot assess standard of provision</li> <li>• Standard insufficient. Allotments need water supply</li> </ul>
<p><b>B:</b> Do you agree with the standards of provision proposed in Issue 88?</p> <p>Support:31 Object: 6 Comment: 3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge City Council supports the standard as same as one they use – beneficial for cross boundary and urban fringe developments</li> <li>• 18 Parish Councils support standard</li> <li>• Would like to see a higher proportion of open space to be given over to informal recreation</li> <li>• By dividing plots into smaller, more manageable sizes, they will be more popular and better maintained.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comberton Parish Council states that this level of provision seems too low based on local use of allotments in Comberton (there is demand for more allotments and a waiting list but the area of allotment use is approximately 1.3 Ha/1000people.</li> <li>• Allotments look horrible and better use can be made of the land e.g. for open spaces, so everyone can use the space.</li> <li>• The allocation should increase to a minimum of 50 allotments per 1000. Likely to be increased demand in future</li> <li>• Ask Parish Councils before applying an inflexible rule.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement to provide open space should not be commuted because this cash has sometimes been used to maintain existing open space.</li> <li>• Provision should be for nearer 10% rather than just over 3%</li> </ul>
<p><b>C:</b> If not, why not? What alternative policy or</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS /ALTERNATIVE APPROACH?:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should also prevent allotment areas that are</li> </ul>

<p>approach do you think should be included?</p> <p>Comment: 5</p>	<p>being properly used from being developed for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand for allotments in Cottenham – waiting list for ones in Rampton Road</li> <li>• If houses were not jammed together would be more room in gardens to grow vegetables and therefore less need for allotments and better living conditions in housing developments</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 89: On-site Open Space</b></p>	
<p>A: Do you agree the thresholds for when on-site open space will be required in new developments?</p> <p>Support: 31 Object: 8 Comment: 7</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support</li> <li>• Support from 16 parish councils</li> <li>• Open space should be useful – not just land left over for open space.</li> <li>• Level for allotments is set too high</li> <li>• Suggest houses having communal areas / larger gardens - Example in Heidelberg</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge City Council objects</li> <li>• Gt and Little Abington PCs does not agree with thresholds</li> <li>• Play space should be provided however small the development. Or make gardens larger for children to play in</li> <li>• Allotments are an eyesore / Space could be better served for other open space for community.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depends on layout of new development and proximity of existing open space.</li> <li>• Agree principle of different sorts of provision but should be on case by case basis</li> <li>• Local people should have say in type of open space to be provided to serve local community</li> <li>• May restrict building of new houses if have this policy.</li> </ul>
<p>B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p> <p>Object: 2 Comment: 7</p>	<p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision for allotments too low. Need for more especially with small gardens and high density developments. Quality of life and health benefits by providing allotments.</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council – on site open space provision should be the norm within new residential development. No justification for figure of 200 dwellings as trigger for open space. Too high a threshold. If large number of small developments come forward with under 200 dwellings and none required to provide open space may result in cumulative impact on surrounding provision.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too rigid. Decision on what open space to provide should be made by local community based on</li> </ul>

	<p>local need not by sliding scale in policy. Developer should give money to Parish Council to allocate according to local needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new development needs open space for healthy environment</li> <li>• Sports pitches should have higher threshold -300 dwellings?</li> <li>• Allotments should have threshold of 100 dwellings – 5 allotment plots per 100 dwelling</li> <li>• Local Council must consider written request by 6+ electors to operate Allotment Act – if demand must provide allotments.</li> <li>• Need for consultation with parish councils</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 90: Allocation for Open Space</b></p>	
<p><b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan carry forward the existing allocations for recreation and open space?</p> <p>Support:31 Object: 9 Comment: 5</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support allocations</li> <li>• 15 Parish Councils support</li> <li>• Should be no reduction in allocation of open space.</li> <li>• Land north of Hatton’s Rd, Longstanton - retains this allocation. To deliver this Local Plan must allocate housing land in village otherwise no funding</li> <li>• Support for allocation of land east of Bar Lane, Stapleford</li> <li>• Sawston – under provision so needs sites allocating</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land East of Mill Lane, Impington – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Histon and Impington is well served for sports facilities according to report</li> <li>▪ Street could not cope with increased traffic</li> <li>▪ Junction with Mill Lane dangerous</li> <li>▪ Would change character of road especially in dark – anti social behaviour; security</li> <li>▪ Existing play park within short walking distance that serves area</li> <li>▪ Larger sites more suitable</li> <li>▪ Loss of valuable agricultural land</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Land east of recreation ground, Over – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sufficient open space in village</li> <li>▪ Other sites available to extend playing fields</li> <li>▪ Land compulsory purchased for extension to playing fields – part used for non-playing field uses</li> <li>▪ Land ideal for housing development</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could make housing sites unviable</li> <li>• Swavesey -Land north of Recreation Ground <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site within Environment Agency Flood Plain and at risk from surface water flooding</li> <li>▪ Land essential to viability of farming enterprise. Any proposal to bring forward recreation use</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>should be addressed alongside future of land to north (SHLAA site 169)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Histon and Impington Parish Council - Under provision of open space in these villages according to recreation study. 37% of recommended standard. Progress of sites - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land to south of Manor Park, Histon- planning application for change of use submitted/ land leased from County</li> <li>None of other sites will be deliverable</li> <li>Land next to existing Recreation Ground owned by Chivers Farms which will not become available</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>B:</b> Are there other areas that should be allocated?</p> <p>Support:4 Object: 0 Comment: 11 Representations:15</p>	<p><b>OTHER AREAS SUGGESTED FOR ALLOCATION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sawston - An allocation to the rear of Dales Manor Business Park, Babraham Road is being considered by the Parish Council in association with the possible Cambridge City FC relocation.</li> <li>NIAB/NIAB2 and new green corridors created around city to local countryside</li> <li>Trumpington Meadows – Country Park</li> <li>Great Shelford Parish Council suggesting – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grange field in Church Street</li> <li>Land between Rectory Farm and 28 Church Street</li> <li>Field to east of railway line, south side of Granhams Road</li> </ul> </li> <li>Histon and Impington – Bypass Farm</li> <li>Milton needs additional recreation land –bounded by A10, A14 and River Cam</li> <li>Broad Location 2 – playing fields both sides of Grantchester Rd, Newnham</li> <li>Milton – Eastern half of field to north of EDF site at Milton Hall</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All proposed areas are to the west and north of Cambridge. What about the rest? Fulbourn? Balsham? Shelford etc.</li> <li>Depends on extent other communities are eventually developed</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 91: Protecting Existing Recreation Areas</b></p>	
<p><b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking to protect existing playing fields and recreation facilities?</p> <p>Support: 66 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is also covered by PVAA policy</li> <li>Support from 25 parish councils</li> <li>Once lost they are gone forever</li> <li>Will be lost because worth more as housing land</li> <li>Sport England supports policy to protect open space as vulnerable asset given their potential value as development land. Support need for replacement facilities to meet criteria relating to quantity, quality and accessibility. Only support the loss of 'surplus' playing fields if evidenced by up to</li> </ul>

	<p>date and robust playing pitch assessment which clearly demonstrated surplus of provision for current and future needs. Replacement sites should be available prior to loss of existing sites, to secure continuity of provision and subject to comparable management arrangements. Support requirement to consider views of local residents and users of sites in question. Consistent with Sport England policy and NPPF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from Cambridge City Council for policy to protect existing playing fields. New Local Green Space designation – need to work with SCDC to establish similar approach to cross boundary green space.</li> <li>• Should include parks, country parks and all other open space in definition</li> <li>• Need to review to ensure best use of land for local area.</li> <li>• Protect except in exceptional circumstances then could do land swap which favours village</li> <li>• Protect particularly at schools</li> <li>• Scarcity of pitches so high cost to use increases cost of participating in sport.</li> <li>• Important for young people as provides physical and mental development</li> </ul>
<p>B: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included.</p> <p><a href="#">Comment: 1</a></p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection can be afforded by dedication under Queen Elizabeth II scheme</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 92: Indoor Community Facilities</b></p>	
<p>A: Should the Local Plan include a policy for indoor community space provision?</p> <p><a href="#">Support:47</a>  <a href="#">Object: 1</a>  <a href="#">Comment: 5</a></p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support to retain character of village</li> <li>• Current policy successful</li> <li>• 22 Parish Council support</li> <li>• This may include upgrades or essential repair of an existing village hall</li> <li>• Standard seems a little low</li> <li>• Should be proportional to the development</li> <li>• Many developments including Cambourne have insufficient community space provision.</li> <li>• Community indoor space vital commodity and should be protected. Usually in short supply. Should be a policy to protect existing facilities, including nonconformist chapels, to prevent them being converted to private use. School premises should be available for community use when not required by the school.</li> <li>• Policy aimed only at small local facilities (village and community halls). No policy for larger scale indoor community facilities such as sports halls</li> </ul>

	<p>and swimming pools. Needs separate policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey evidence is valuable. Past behaviour in SCDC has been good and appreciated and should continue</li> <li>• Such facilities are important to building a community</li> <li>• The Local Plan should address the need for indoor space in those settlements where it does not exist as identified in the Community Facilities Audit 2009</li> <li>• An expanded village will need larger indoor facilities.</li> <li>• Need for all weather pitches</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from Over Parish Council</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build youth centres for teenagers to keep them off streets</li> <li>• Higher standard for new communities should be stated in the policy</li> <li>• Could impact viability of small development sites if have to provide funds for such facilities. Cambridge Sports Village could deliver new facilities</li> <li>• Policies should be in place for new community facilities, but not then retrospectively applied to existing facilities, without detailed consultations.</li> </ul>
<p>B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p> <p>Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where existing space exists which would give the whole village standards as proposed no sense in building more. Needs consultation with parish councils and those organisations running village halls. A financial contribution to improve existing facilities might be just as valuable.</li> </ul>
<b>QUESTION 93: Light, Noise and Odour Issues</b>	
<p>A: Should the Local Plan include policies dealing with lighting, noise and odour issues?</p> <p>Support: 56 Object: 0 Comment: 3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To retain village character</li> <li>• Support from 24 parish councils</li> <li>• Issues impact quality of life</li> <li>• Stop light pollution and limit noise from football stadium/ concert venues</li> <li>• Problem of light pollution – keep street lighting to minimum</li> <li>• May still be problems of odour from existing industrial sites</li> <li>• Concerns over noise from light aircraft</li> <li>• Environmental factors can negatively impact on neighbouring dwellings –E.g. In Caldecote new dwelling problems by being next to Bourne Airfield</li> <li>• Conservators of River Cam suggest policy be</li> </ul>

	<p>extended to residential moorings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Histon and Impington Parish Council concerns about air quality from A14 and Orchard Park noise barrier causing pollution. Need for site specific policies for noise and particulate pollution</li> <li>• Imperial War Museum concerned if any proposed policy restricted movement of aircraft around Duxford – could have commercial implications for IWM and jeopardise future.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where development is located adjacent to larger roads it is quite clear that noise will have an impact. Why need to submit a supporting statement? Surely, where impact is accepted and mitigation is being proposed, a statement is superfluous? Planning should take on board these obvious conclusions and only require a report where the applicant is trying to show that mitigation is not required.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 94: Contaminated Land</b></p>	
<p>A: Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking appropriate investigation and remediation of contaminated land?</p> <p>Support: 47 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support even if land is suspected of contamination it should be investigated and remedial action taken if necessary so no long term effect for residents of new buildings.</li> <li>• Support from 20 parish councils</li> <li>• Land around any contaminated site should be tested too to ensure chemicals have not spread outside boundary area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 95: Air Quality</b></p>	
<p>A: Should the Local Plan include a policy dealing with air quality?</p> <p>Support: 47 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should take into account air quality issues arising from increased traffic movement associated with development</li> <li>• Support from 22 parish councils.</li> <li>• Air pollution should not be a problem in rural district</li> <li>• Histon and Impington Parish Council support policy – concern at delay on A14 upgrade. Need for site specific policies on particulate pollution.</li> <li>• Need tighter emission controls on old polluting buses</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 96: Low Emissions Strategies</b></p>	
<p>A: Should the Local Plan include a requirement for Low Emissions Strategies?</p> <p>Support: 38 Object: 0 Comment: 4</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support including 20 parish councils</li> <li>• Conservators of the River Cam request that River Cam corridor should be designated as an Air Quality Management Area given the number of people that use waterway for recreation.</li> <li>• Cottenham Parish Council supports but questions inclusion of dust emissions. Can be created in</li> </ul>

	<p>actual construction process affecting soil and in these conditions development should be stopped.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Support policy but in order to limit growth in travel need to limit total population of region and employment population.</li></ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Caldecote Parish Council states that there needs to be tighter and more enforceable regulations regarding low emission strategies on building developers, in particular with regard to insulation and energy efficiencies.</li></ul>
--	---