

## Appendix B: Summaries of Representations – Wellbeing and social inclusion Chapter

### Contents

<b>Wellbeing and social inclusion.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Table of representations: Wellbeing and social inclusion (sites).....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>WS/CF: Community, sports and leisure facilities .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>WS/PH: Protection of public houses.....</b>	<b>38</b>

## Wellbeing and social inclusion

### Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Wellbeing and social inclusion](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

### Number of Representations for this section

42

### Notes

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on the Wellbeing and Social Inclusion policies, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific housing and open space policies. These comments have been moved to the specific policy: H/AH Affordable Housing, H/HM Housing mix and BG/EO Providing and enhancing open spaces.
- Some comments attached to this section relate to transport, water efficiency, urban and specific sites. In many cases the representors that made these comments have also made similar comments on the relevant sections within the plan. Where appropriate we will review placement of these comments in the final version of these representation summaries which will accompany the draft plan.

## Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council      DC= District Council      TC= Town Council

## Executive Summary

There was good general support for the overarching aims of the proposed wellbeing and inclusion policies from site promoters, the University of Cambridge, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group, Cambourne TC and Central Bedfordshire Council. Huntingdonshire District Council had no comment on this policy area. Two site promoters expressed the need for a more balanced provision of affordable housing and sustainable travel across Greater Cambridge, in order to achieve the Local Plan's identified wellbeing and social inclusion aspirations. Fen Ditton PC was broadly supportive of aspiration but concerned with the ambiguity in some of the detail.

One member of the public expressed a need for new residential development to be no more than 4 storeys high, inclusive and provide open spaces with a balanced approach to cycling. Existing sporting facilities must be maintained and improved to safe, modern requirements. One member of the public suggested the Local Plan should include policies to protect cultural significance, specifically to support cultural activities and to provide for, and safeguard public and private spaces for arts and other activities.

In terms of social & transport infrastructure provision, comments from two members of the public and three PCs: Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, Great Shelford; and Teversham were received. They cited concerns over the need: to consider the impact of high growth strategy on existing residents; for access to GPs and other primary care services and the retention of those services in villages; for active travel to be a feasible choice; and to invest in sports and leisure facilities, swimming pools, across the city and especially near large new developments. There was little evidence of detailed plans regarding infrastructure to support well-being and inclusion, communities need green community spaces, public parks, policing, schools, shops. They noted transport to any services and social support are essential to achieving wellbeing along with lower housing densities, increased dwelling space standards and access to private amenity space. Histon & Impington PC stated water efficiency must be compulsory.

DB Group Holdings raised the matter of the Local Plan ensuring a variety of employment opportunities are available across the District for all members of the community. Cambridge Past, Present & Future noted the protection and enhancement of the Historic

Environment is not just key to creating and providing Great Places but also a vital part of Wellbeing.

One member of the public cited the North East Cambridge proposal, with the relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP).will have a negative impact on residents and users of the surrounding area. Another member of the public suggested policies should acknowledge both the health and amenity benefits of visible green open space even if not publicly accessible. A different member of the public noted the need to balance climate change mitigation and adaptations with provision of a good standard of amenity. There was also no mention of people with disabilities. Linton PC highlighted the need to consider needs of elderly people.

The Environment Agency, while supportive of the opportunity to level-up communities, tackling this green inequality at scale and improving the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the GC area, caveated that for this to be achieved this needs to be balanced with the need to protect the environment, by providing appropriate wildlife refuges from human disruption and interference.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties considered the Local Plan will only worsen environmental damage and fail to serve Cambridge citizens who are disadvantaged, and the planned growth will only serve our significantly privileged citizens.

Many comments were submitted by site promoters indicating that their sites, if allocated for development would support the Local Plan's aspiration for creating healthy developments. Stapleford PC advised against 100-dwelling add-on developments rather the provision of infill brownfield sites with affordable housing would support inclusivity and develop wellbeing.

Several groups and individual members of the public highlighted the negative impact the relocation of CWWTP to Honey Hill would have on local amenity in terms of noise, odour and vibration pollution.

## Table of Representations: Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed wellbeing and inclusion policies.	57207 (Abrdn), 57272 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial), 58207 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Retail), 58526 (Marshall Group Properties), 58643 (University of Cambridge) & 58315 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58782 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company) (59174) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), (59222) Cambourne Town Council, 59697 (Central Bedfordshire Council)
If the Plan is going to meet the wellbeing and social inclusion aspirations identified, then there needs to be a better balance to ensure that affordable housing and sustainable travel is provided across the urban and rural areas of Greater Cambridge, not just Cambridge, the edge of Cambridge and new settlements.	57176 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd) 57250 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
Need to ensure new residential development is no more than 4 storeys high, inclusive and provide open spaces	57276 (D Lott)
Need balanced approach towards cycling	57276 (D Lott)
No Comment	57406 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Existing many sporting facilities must be maintained/improved to safe/modern requirements.	57276 (D Lott)
<p>Social &amp; Transport Infrastructure Provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact of high growth strategy on existing residents needs to be evaluated including water</li> <li>- Policy should address the need for access to GPs and other primary care services and the retention of those services in villages</li> <li>- Active travel should be a feasible choice.</li> <li>- Need to invest in sports and leisure facilities, swimming pools, across the city and especially near large new developments.</li> <li>- little evidence of detailed plans regarding infrastructure to support well-being and inclusion, communities need green community spaces, public parks, policing, schools, shops.</li> <li>- Transport to any services and social support is a huge part of wellbeing.</li> </ul>	57537 (C Martin); (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC); (D Lister); 59127 (Great Shelford PC); 59232 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lower housing density, increased dwelling space standards and access to private amenity space are also essential to achieving wellbeing.</li> </ul>	
<p>Fulfilment of S/NEC Policy through relocation of CWWTP will have a negative impact on residents and users of the surrounding area.</p>	57680 (J Conroy)
<p>Water efficiency must be compulsory.</p>	57874 (Histon & Impington PC)
<p>Policies should acknowledge specifically the health benefits and amenity benefits of visible green open space such as college or other playing fields even if not publicly accessible</p>	57962 (E Davies)
<p>The Local Plan should ensure that a variety of employment opportunities are available across the District for all members of the community. This includes protecting and enabling the growth of established and successful businesses in the District such as DB Group (Holdings) LTD</p>	58277 (DB Group Holdings LTD)
<p>Need to consider needs of elderly people.</p>	58435 (Linton PC)
<p>Protecting and enhancing the Historic Environment is not only key to creating and providing Great Places but a vital part of Wellbeing.</p>	58784 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

<b>Summary of issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
<p>The GC Local Plan presents an opportunity to level-up communities, tackling this green inequality at scale and improving the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the GC area, by creating and contributing to healthier, greener, and more accessible environments. This must, however, be achieved in balance with the need to protect the environment, by providing appropriate wildlife refuges from human disruption and interference.</p>	<p>59728 (Environment Agency)</p>
<p>Need to balance the climate change mitigation/adaptations with providing a good standard of amenity. No mention of disabled people.</p>	<p>59779 (B Hunt)</p>
<p>Broadly supportive of aspiration but concerned at ambiguity in some of the detail.</p>	<p>59925 (Fen Ditton PC)</p>
<p>The Local Plan should include policies to protect cultural significance, and specifically to support cultural activities, and to provide for, and safeguard, public and private spaces for arts and other activities.</p>	<p>60201 (J Preston)</p>
<p>Support protection of valuable open spaces although planned development in the north part of the city threatens these spaces.</p>	<p>60772 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>



Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Local Plan's will only worsen environmental damage and fail to serve Cambridge citizens who are disadvantaged and the planned growth will only serve our significantly privileged citizens.</p> <p>A good standard of living, affording to get onto the property ladder, is not accessible to many local residents who grow up here and additionally deterring those living in other places from coming to live here.</p>	

**Table of representations: Wellbeing and social inclusion (sites)**

Summary of site related issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>The land at Fen Ditton site would include the aspiration for creating a healthy new development, providing the opportunity to create a healthy community with infrastructure supporting community activity, health, education and quality of life. Achieved through a combination of a compact mixed-use urban structure and providing integrated green space which creates the conditions for people to lead healthy lives by encouraging 'active travel',</p>	<p>60575 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)</p>

Summary of site related issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>reducing vehicular traffic, improving the public realm and enhancing social interaction. Include 'equigenesis': an equalising environment that uplifts everyone's health and well-being.</p>	
<p>The provision of new sports pitches and a village hall /sports pavilion on Land at Fulbourn Road, Teversham will wholly support the ambitions of Policy WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments and Policy WS/CF: Community, sports and leisure facilities.</p>	56900 (RWS Ltd)
<p>The redevelopment of the Clifton Road Industrial Estate will have opportunities to improve the wellbeing and inclusion of local residents.</p>	57272 (Universities Superannuation Scheme -Commercial)
<p>Avoid 100-dwelling add-on developments; provide infill brownfield sites with affordable housing which support inclusive and develop wellbeing.</p>	57530 (Stapleford PC)
<p>The creation of truly mixed-use communities, maximising access to jobs and facilities for all residents, as proposed at North Cambourne, is a key measure in assessing which sites should come forward for development.</p>	57908 (Martin Grant Homes)

<b>Summary of site related issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
<p>Larger sites are preferred in achieving overall gains for inclusion and balanced place making, as they can better provide: homes for all parts of the community; a wider range of accessible jobs; support the delivery of low carbon transport infrastructure; ensure that infrastructure, services and facilities are provided alongside new employment and homes; and support arts and culture.</p>	
<p>IWM is supportive of aims for supporting wellbeing and inclusion and can make a significant contribution to local health and wellbeing, including placemaking and identity, community engagement and social inclusion.</p>	<p>58018 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)</p>
<p>Cambridge East has the scale to achieve transformational change in the east of the City that will significantly improve the lives of local residents through the provision of job opportunities, affordable homes and a range of cultural, leisure and retail options.</p>	<p>58526 (Marshall Group Properties)</p>
<p>Land at Meldreth provides an opportunity to provide for sustainable growth in the southern part of the rural area where there are not necessarily other suitable locations.</p>	<p>58933 (Phase 2 Planning)</p>

<b>Summary of site related issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
<p>Comprehensively planned development at Cambridge South would bring opportunities for local living, particularly for those in housing need and those working at the Biomedical Campus for whom housing is unaffordable or inaccessible. A fully integrated community is proposed with supporting recreation, health and social infrastructure – with tangible benefits for health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>59000 Jesus College (working with Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings), a private landowner and St John's College</p>
<p>The proposals at Whittlesford would help to build a healthy and sustainable community.</p>	<p>59119 (Grosvenor Britain &amp; Ireland)</p>
<p>The scale of development at Cambridge East provides a significant opportunity to meet, not only the needs of the future Cambridge East residents, but also a wider demand for community, sports and leisure facilities close to the city centre that might not be capable of being accommodated on other more constrained sites.</p>	<p>58535 (Marshall Group Properties)</p>
<p>If the site at Comberton were to be allocated this would provide a key opportunity to provide much needed specialist housing for older people in a sustainable location which would benefit the wider community. The characteristics of Extra Care development (such as the provision of on-site services</p>	<p>59773 (Endurance Estates)</p>

Summary of site related issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>and facilities) should enable consideration of where this can contribute towards mixed and balanced communities and sustainable growth in rural areas.</p>	
<p>Support the development of new facilities in appropriate locations where there is local need. At CBC there is an identified need for the social infrastructure, community and leisure facilities that can help a community thrive, and which foster great placemaking. Social infrastructure and community uses will provide a key part of the supportive environment for clusters and innovation districts, and different users onsite.</p>	<p>58843 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust),</p>
<p>The fulfilment of S/NEC policy through the relocation of CWWTP to Honey Hill is contrary to this policy and would lead to adverse effects in terms of noise, odour and vibration pollution and contravenes WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety.</p>	<p>56512 (Catherine Martin), 57578 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57627 (J Pratt), 57681 (Jennifer Conroy)</p>

## **WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments**

### **Hyperlink for all comments**

Open this hyperlink - [Policy WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

### **Number of Representations for this section**

43

### **Abbreviations**

- PC= Parish Council      DC= District Council      TC= Town Council

### **Executive Summary**

General support for the approach towards the WS/HD Creating healthy new developments policy. Those indicating their support included Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Groups, Cambourne TC, Great and Little Chishill PC, Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties, two members of the public and three developers; one of which suggested the policy should go further with other measures which maximise wellbeing benefits. There were also many comments from individuals and site promoters stating the application of Health Impact Assessments should only relate to major developments with one site promoter requesting the threshold being outlined.

Cambridge Cycling Campaign cited the need for new developments to integrate transport and cycling infrastructure which supports all types of uses and users. One member of the public noted adequate allotment provision will contribute to healthy developments. Natural England suggested the policy include links to the importance of adequate levels and qualities of accessible green

infrastructure. One developer and another site promoter, while supportive of the application of health principles to new development, stated the ten Healthy New Towns principles were onerous and development should apply these where possible.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties supported the idea of “high quality people-focused spaces” but requested more details on these. They suggested the Local Plan should support interventions like those set out in the ‘Encouraging Healthier Takeaways in Low Income Communities’. They would also like to see council involvement to see local businesses who already produce healthy food for the residents of Cambridge having a presence in local shops in Chesterton, Arbury, Abbey and Kings Hedges. The Council should approach these local businesses and provide incentives for them to trade in areas where all local people can access them; not just those who live in Market or Petersfield or Trumpington.

**Table of Representations: Policy WS/HD - Creating healthy new developments**

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed creating healthy new developments policy	58837 (CBC Limited), 59179 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG), 59224 (Cambourne TC), 59773 (Endurance Estates), 59780 (B Hunt), 60133 (Christopher Blakeley), 60153 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60422 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 60224 & 60553 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60774 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Policies could go further to set out requirements on not only creating healthy new developments, but other measures which maximise wellbeing benefits that developments can offer those who build them, those who live in them and the communities around them now and into the future.	60224 & 60553 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

<b>Summary of issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
Health Impact Assessments: The requirement should only relate to major developments.	57098 (C King), 57298 (C Sawyer Nutt), 58868 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Ltd), 59158 (Endurance Estates), 60289 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60340 & 60351 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60360 (H.J. Molton Settlement), 60379 (S & J Graves), 60389 (D Wright), 60469 (P,J&M Crow)
Need to outline threshold where a Health Impact Assessment is required.	59015 (Metro Property Unit Trust)
New developments must integrate transport and cycling infrastructure which supports all types of uses and users.	59025 (Cambridge Cycling Campaign)
Adequate allotment provision will contribute to healthy developments.	59293 (D Fox)
The policy should include strong links to the importance of adequate level and quality of accessible green infrastructure	59980 (Natural England)
Supportive of application of health principles to new development, however the ten Healthy New Towns principles are onerous. Rather, development should apply these where possible.  Clarification on when Health Impact Assessments are needed and not needed.	60521 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60575 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)



Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the idea of “high quality people-focused spaces” but want more detail on these.	60774 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
<p>Policy which restricts the development and locations of hot food takeaways seems sound. How can we encourage and enable local families to eat a balanced and sufficient diet?</p> <p>The Local Plan should support interventions that help to reverse this trend like those set out in the ‘Encouraging Healthier Takeaways in Low Income Communities’</p>	60774 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
<p>Want council involvement to see local businesses who already produce healthy food for the residents of Cambridge having a presence in local shops in Chesterton, Arbury, Abbey and Kings Hedges. The Council should approach these local businesses and provide incentives for them to trade in areas where all local people can access them; not just those who live in Market or Petersfield or Trumpington.</p>	60774 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

## **WS/CF: Community, sports and leisure facilities**

### **Hyperlink for all comments**

Open this hyperlink - [Policy WS/CF: Community, sports and leisure facilities](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

### **Number of Representations for this section**

32

### **Abbreviations**

- PC= Parish Council      DC= District Council      TC= Town Council      RA = Residents' Association

### **Executive Summary**

General support for the approach towards the Policy WS/CF Community, sports and leisure facilities policy. Those indicating their support included Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC, Steeple Morden PC, Guilden Morden PC, Great and Little Chishill PC and Marshall Group Properties.

Cambourne TC supported the policy but stated it should not rely on community hubs providing facilities as they do not meet all the diverse age and cultural needs. Croydon PC and Trumpington RA, while both supportive of the policy, noted the need for transport for outlying villages to access facilities and for long-term support for community, sports and leisure facilities beyond the early stages

in a development, respectively. Huntingdonshire District Council had no comment on this policy area. Barrington PC requested a much stronger policy definition for Community Healthcare facilities which should be prioritised given their poor provision under the current Plan.

One member of the public requested the prioritisation of a new swimming pool for public access in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, especially in the latter due to lack of provision and new development, and existing capacity especially in Cambridge being over capacity. This should not just consider future demand but existing demand especially from students and South Cambridgeshire population into Cambridge. Histon and Impington PC stated the need to aim for a swimming pool within cycling distance of every community. Subscription based sports facilities should be discouraged to enable their use by all. Sport England requested their 'Active Design' be referenced in the policy for the development of new facilities that encourage people to take part in sport and physical activity. The Cambridge Futsal Club, with the support of Cambridge Handball Club indicated the lack of a venue in the whole of Cambridgeshire large enough to host national level indoor sports events watched by seated spectators. One member of the public highlighted that Cambridge skateparks are not suitable for year-round use; to be suitable in winter these require lighting and rain covers. One developer cited the lack of evidence on existing levels of open space and whether these are sufficient.

Two site promoters noted the need for the policy to set out how new community, sports and leisure facilities will be provided and sustained through new development. The type and scale of facilities should be commensurate to the size of the development proposed. One member of the public requested further information about preventing landlords from evicting Clubs operating on their land or charging a rent so high the Club is forced to leave. Two site promoters supported the policy but requested further clarification about what is deemed 'appropriate' and thresholds for contributions and whether these are provided on/off-site. Two city centre site promoters confirmed the proposed policy clearly stated community, sports and leisure facilities are appropriate in mixed-

use developments, such as Lion Yard, Grand Arcade & Guildhall Chambers. They noted these are vital to ensuring continued vitality in this type of development.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Education) raised associated safeguarding concerns where facilities are used by the school and the wider community. Separate access arrangements are needed and expected to be fully funded by the developer to mitigate the level of risk. Early engagement is needed to mutually agree the basis on which access to the facilities will be managed. One developer supported the policy but went on to state the capacity of existing facilities and capacity offered by educational establishments needs consideration to ensure that provision is not sought, where capacity exists elsewhere.

The Education and Skills Funding Agency (Department for Education) requested the policy makes clear that education facilities serving a wider catchment area will not be considered a town centre use requiring sequential approach to be applied, but that any such facilities must be in sustainable, accessible locations.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group requested planning policies actively support the strategic plans of local health commissioners, and new health facilities to meet the needs of the population should be supported. These should enable flexibility within the NHS estate. Where it can be demonstrated that health facilities will be changed as part of wider NHS estate reorganisation programmes, it should be accepted that a facility is neither needed nor viable for its current use and planning policies within the Local Plan must support the principle of alternative uses for NHS land and property.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlighted the social impact of access to a good standard of education. Growing inaccessibility to social care and services mean many families miss out on help, entrenching patterns of inequality throughout lives. A space to study at home and parents who provide books making a bigger difference than school attendance. They requested better accessibility to community, sports and leisure facilities, and recreational green open spaces. They also

objected to the built open space alongside the Meadows Community Centre in Arbury and would like to see existing open spaces in Arbury turned into spaces for recreational use.

**Table of Representations: WS/CF- Community, sports and leisure facilities**

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed Community, sports and leisure facilities policy.	57715 & 57716 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 58535 (Marshall Group Properties), 60009 (Steeple Morden PC), 60087 (Guilden Morden PC), 60423 (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Prioritise the build of new swimming pool for public access in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, especially in the latter due to lack of provision and new development, and existing capacity especially in Cambridge being over capacity. More appropriate provision will also reduce traffic in Newmarket Road and East Road, two existing choke points. Build should be looked at not just on future demand but existing demand especially from students and South Cambridgeshire population into Cambridge.	56507 & 58812 (M Tansini)
Need to aim for a swimming pool within cycling distance of every community.	57866 (Histon and Impington PC)

<b>Summary of issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
Subscription based sports facilities should be discouraged to enable their use by all. This will then include the society at large.	57880 (Histon & Impington PC)
Support policy however transport is also needed for outlying villages to access facilities	56748 (Croydon PC)
There is no venue in the whole of Cambridgeshire large enough to host national level indoor sports events watched by seated spectators.	56787 (C Horton, Chairman of Cambridge Futsal Club & with the support of Cambridge Handball Club)
Sport England would like to see their 'Active Design' referenced in the policy for the development of new facilities that encourage people to take part in sport and physical activity.	56856 (Sport England)
Where facilities are used by the school and the wider community, there are associated safeguarding concerns. Separate access arrangements are needed and expected to be fully funded by the developer to mitigate the level of risk. Early engagement is needed to mutually agree the basis on which access to the facilities will be managed.	56950 (Cambridgeshire County Council - Education)
Supports for the policy however there is a need to provide long-term support for community, sports and leisure facilities,	56982 (Trumpington RA)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>continuing beyond the early stages in a development. Based on our experience in the Southern Fringe, it would have been very beneficial to have greater support for the community development process over a longer period than has been possible through the s106 funding and Council budget. This might have helped mitigate the level of anti-social behaviour that has become a problem in the Southern Fringe developments.</p>	
<p>Important to provide a policy setting out how new community, sports and leisure facilities will be provided and sustained through new development. The type and scale of facilities should be commensurate to the size of the development proposed.</p>	<p>57178 (Southern &amp; Regional Developments Ltd), 57253 (European Property Ventures -Cambridgeshire)</p>
<p>The proposed policy WS/CF makes clear that community, sports and leisure facilities are appropriate in mixed-use developments, such as Lion Yard, Grand Arcade &amp; Guildhall Chambers. This is vital to ensuring continued vitality in this type of development.</p>	<p>57209 (Abrdn), 58208 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Retail)</p>
<p>No Comment</p>	<p>57408 (Huntingdonshire District Council)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Request policy makes clear that education facilities serving a wider catchment area will not be considered a town centre use requiring sequential approach to be applied, but that any such facilities must be in sustainable, accessible locations.</p> <p>Plan states that new and replacement facilities should facilitate the growth of the area by providing sufficient capacity to accommodate community need and demand.</p> <p>Request an addition, explaining that in some cases this will include wider sub-regional community demand, and for educational facilities there is a national policy requirement to provide a sufficient choice of school places, which is not necessarily same as meeting a capacity need within a specific pupil place planning area.</p>	<p>57485 (ESFA - Department for Education)</p>
<p>Cambridge skateparks are not suitable for year-round use. To be suitable in winter, our local skateparks need lights (which could be extinguished late at night to discourage anti-social use), and rain cover. Simple adjustments to provide more space could also be implemented, such as smooth access paths (e.g. Jesus Green).</p>	<p>58000 (J Humphrey)</p>



<b>Summary of issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
<p>No updated evidence on existing levels of open space and whether these are sufficient. In area where there is a lack of existing open space or facilities then enabling development may be required to ensure delivery.</p>	<p>58872 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Ltd)</p>
<p>Support policy direction. The capacity of existing facilities and capacity offered by educational establishments needs consideration to ensure that provision is not sought, where capacity exists elsewhere.</p>	<p>59017 (Metro Property Unit Trust)</p>
<p>Planning policies should actively support the strategic plans of local health commissioners, and new health facilities to meet the needs of the population should be supported.</p> <p>It is essential that all planning policies enable flexibility within the NHS estate. Where it can be demonstrated that health facilities will be changed as part of wider NHS estate reorganisation programmes, it should be accepted that a facility is neither needed nor viable for its current use and Planning policies within the Local Plan must support the principle of alternative uses for NHS land and property.</p>	<p>59183 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Support for the policy; should not rely on community hubs providing facilities as this will not meet all the diverse age and cultural needs.</p>	<p>59228 (Cambourne TC)</p>
<p>Is it possible to guard against landlords who wish, at the end of a lease, to give notice to a Club on their land, or charge a rent so high that the Club is forced to leave?</p> <p>I note that The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will identify what facilities are needed. Is the Planning Department aware of the “Place Standard” Survey carried out by Cllr Sam Davies for Queen Edith’s and published in Feb 2020?</p>	<p>59781 (B Hunt)</p>
<p>Community Healthcare facilities should be prioritised as they have been poorly provided for under the current Plan. Much stronger policy definition is required.</p>	<p>59856 (Barrington PC)</p>
<p>Support for the policy however, clarification is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what is deemed ‘appropriate’ and thresholds for whether this will be on-site contributions or off-site?</li> <li>• what is considered to be a ‘large scale development’ i.e. is this major development as defined by the NPPF, or is this a locally set measure?</li> </ul>	<p>60522 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60576 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)</p>

<b>Summary of issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
<p>A good standard of education should be offered to all citizens and good schools can strengthen and stabilise local communities giving children and young people a steady foundation for their future. Growing inaccessibility to social care and services mean many families miss out on help, entrenching patterns of inequality throughout lives. A space to study at home and parents who provide books making a bigger difference than school attendance.</p>	<p>60775 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>
<p>Need ways of giving ownership of the arts to young people. Better accessibility to community, sports and leisure facilities, and recreational green open spaces.</p> <p>Object to the built open space alongside the Meadows Community Centre in Arbury and want to see existing open spaces in Arbury turned into spaces for recreational use.</p>	<p>60775 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>

## **WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments**

### **Hyperlink for all comments**

Open this hyperlink - [Policy WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

### **Number of Representations for this section**

17

### **Abbreviations**

- PC= Parish Council      DC= District Council      TC= Town Council

### **Executive Summary**

A wide variety of organisations, citizens, landowners, and developers expressed support for this policy. Persimmon Homes East Midlands were supportive of the policy but asked that it was not mandatory. A few respondents asked for the policy's scope to be amended to include different uses: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG for example asked for developers to provide short-term solutions for the NHS to deliver services for new residents whilst development was taking place, Cam-Skate asked for skateboard facilities to be included in the policy and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties recommended that temporary spaces be used to assist with unaffordable housing via property guardianship. Several respondents objected to 'meanwhile uses' being implemented in the Green Belt.

**Table of Representations: WS/MU - Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments**

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments policy.	56631 (Gamlingay PC), 56983 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57409 (Huntingdonshire District Council), 57717 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 57881 (Histon & Impington PC), 58005 (J Humphrey), 58725 (University of Cambridge), 58847 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 59231 (Cambourne Town Council), 60154 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60765 (U+I Group PLC)
Meanwhile use on sites proposed in Green Belt while waiting for consents should not be permitted	56903 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57616 (J Pratt)
Supportive of requirement but this should not be mandatory.	57388 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)
Support: Cambridge has a real lack of indoor skateboarding facilities.	58117 (G Gardner - Cam-Skate)
Support including NHS services. Developers need to provide (at their own cost) flexible short term solutions for the NHS to deliver services for new residents whilst wider development is taking place.	59186 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG)
Recommend temporary spaces and buildings are used to assist with unaffordable housing via property guardianship.	60776 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

## **WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments**

### **Hyperlink for all comments**

Open this hyperlink - [Policy WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new development](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

### **Number of Representations for this section**

20

### **Abbreviations**

- PC= Parish Council      DC= District Council      TC= Town Council

### **Executive Summary**

There was some support for the aims of policy from a mix for parish councils, private developers and other agencies. A number of developers discussed how the development of their site would support the policy. Several suggestions were made for the detailed policy wording including:

- its application only to strategic development over a certain scale;
- flexibility where it is not possible meet the policy due to local circumstances or the availability of labour;
- the inclusion of text that supports employment related development that would generate high skilled jobs locally;
- requiring developers to offer apprenticeship scheme linked to Further Education opportunities.

There were also a number of objections to the proposed policy direction with the Home Builders Federation suggesting that it is not justified against the tests set out in the NPPF and the CIL regulations with work already taking place to improve skills and opportunities through the CITB.

Questions were asked around how expansive the definition of “inclusive” would be and how it would address socio-economic exclusion. There was also a request for support for more opportunities for young people to develop in the science and tech sectors and within Cambridge University.

**Table of Representations: WS/IO - Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments**

<b>Summary of issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments policy.	56632 (Gamlingay PC), 57719 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 59234 (Cambourne TC), 60225 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60279 (Commercial Estates Group), 60554 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60577 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)
The creation of more jobs creates need for more homes.	(56749) Croydon PC
Policy is best suited to large strategic sized developments of over 500 dwellings and New Town proposals.	57179 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57254 (European Property Ventures Cambridgeshire)
Object	57389 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)
No comment	57410 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

<b>Summary of issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
<p>To achieve an increase in high skilled jobs, text should be included within Policy WS/IO that supports employment related development that would generate high skilled jobs within the local area.</p>	<p>57420 (Mission Street Ltd)</p>
<p>How will the Plan ensure that employment opportunities in new developments are ones which meet descriptions of being “inclusive” beyond the statutory requirements on protected characteristics?</p> <p>How can the Plan prevent the type of socio-economic exclusion in the current Cambridge job market?</p>	<p>58009 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)</p>
<p>Need to support local community engagement with the construction industry. Investment should give residents the opportunity to gain employment and skills on development sites. Developers need to offer apprenticeship scheme linked to Further Education opportunities.</p>	<p>58957 (bpha)</p>
<p>Unclear how this Policy is justified against the tests set out in NPPF paragraph 57 and regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations.</p>	<p>60155 (Home Builders Federation)</p>



Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>The construction industry already contribute to improving skills and opportunities through CITB, who are leading a variety of programmes to develop skills.</p>	
<p>Support for Policy, however some flexibility in the policy is needed as it may not always be possible or realistic to meet the policy requirements due to local circumstances or labour availability at the time of works.</p>	<p>60523 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)</p>
<p>Support for Policy, however there are no routes into the science &amp; tech business and Cambridge University careers for local citizens. There needs to be more opportunities for young people to grow and develop their skills, knowledge and passions with interesting careers.</p>	<p>60777 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>
<p>Marshall has a strong interest in creating inclusive employment and business opportunities, in accordance with the policy objectives of Policy WS/IO.</p>	<p>58541 (Marshall Group Properties)</p>
<p>Need for spaces for small and medium companies and incubation spaces across Cambridge. The Campus expansion will allow for such spaces alongside other flexible business uses and is an opportunity to create inclusive employment and business opportunities.</p>	<p>58850 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)</p>

## **WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety**

### **Hyperlink for all comments**

Open this hyperlink - [Policy WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

### **Number of Representations for this section**

21

### **Abbreviations**

- PC= Parish Council      DC= District Council      TC= Town Council

### **Executive Summary**

A wide variety of respondents expressed support for this policy. The Environmental Agency supported the policy but argued that its scope needed to be widened to protect Cambridge's aquifer. The Environmental Agency also noted that hazardous facilities have the potential to pollute the environment, but strategic planning of waste and resources can address this issue. The University of Cambridge also asked for the policy's scope to be widened so that it will protect Cambridge's research environment; specific requests included adding mitigation against electromagnetic interference into the policy and protecting research undertaken by the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory. Croydon PC asked for the policy to be reviewed in the context of major transport infrastructure and Linton PC asked for exclusion zones around key infrastructure cables and sites.

Some parish councils argued that pollution levels were unacceptable, so the monitoring of existing high-density areas is required, and mitigation measures should be implemented in areas of new development. Similarly, the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties included numerous recommendations to address pollution in existing city-centres and new settlements. Trumpington Resident Association argued that reducing light pollution should not be used to justify not lighting pedestrian desire lines. Several developers objected to the policy, arguing that it fails to recognise that potential negative impacts from development can be mitigated against.

**Table of Representations: WS/HS - Pollution, health and safety**

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed pollution, health and safety policy.	57027 (The Wildlife Trust), 57578 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57720 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 58813 (University of Cambridge), 59189 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group CGC), 59240 (Cambourne TC), 60010 (Steeple Morden PC), 60478 (Anglian Water Services Ltd), 60424 (Great and Little Chishill PC)
No comment	57411 (Huntingdonshire DC)
The policy needs to be considered in the context of major road and rail infrastructure which will cause pollution.	56750 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The need to minimise light pollution should not be used as a reason to not light pedestrian desire lines as this would contradict the aim of reducing car use.	56984 (Trumpington Residents Association)
Pollution in some areas is perceived to be at unacceptable levels in certain areas, so monitoring of existing high-density areas is required, and mitigation measures should be implemented in areas of new development.	57883 (Histon & Impington PC)
Policy should include reduction of noise, light pollution and improvement of air quality along with exclusion zones around gas, electric cables and water treatment plants.	58444 (Linton PC)
Electromagnetic interference (EMI) should also be included in the policy.	58813 (University of Cambridge)
The policy should help to protect the research environment including equipment, which is sensitive to noise, vibration and not just human receptors.	58813 (University of Cambridge)
Policy to protect research undertaken by the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge should be rolled forward into the Local Plan.	58813 (University of Cambridge)
Would welcome a policy that details how land contamination should be considered, which would ensure land is suitable for	59729 (Environmental Agency)

<b>Summary of issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
end-use, but also ensures that the quality of underlying aquifers is protected.	
Welcome the fact that the policy will provide protection to and from hazardous installations, however these facilities also have the potential to pollute the environment. Strategic planning of waste and resource use provides the opportunity to address this issue.	59729 (Environmental Agency)
As part of Anglian Water's Statement of Common Ground with the two Councils, they would welcome support in the Price Review 2024 submissions for their case for greater investment in river health in AMP8 (2025 - 2030).	60478 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
Anglian Water want to work with the two Councils to develop a low-energy intensity approach to the design and operation of assets. In relation to the policy, the new wastewater recycling facility will seek to reduce emissions compared to the existing facility.	60478 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
Argue that the policy fails to recognise that impacts could be mitigated against it. It is suggested that the wording of the policy is changed to:	60524 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60579 Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>'we propose that this policy will require that development does not lead to, or is subject to significant adverse effects as a result of noise, vibration, odour, and/or light pollution unless these effects can be satisfactorily mitigated against'.</p>	
<p>Welcomes initiatives to reduce movements within settlements and to enhance active or electric transport. In addition to this, the Party lists aspirations that it wants to deliver including: an emissions-free zone in the centre of Cambridge, major investment into active transport and bus networks, low traffic neighbourhoods, strict rules against vehicle idling, and accelerating the shift to electric vehicles. Furthermore, the Party supports the embedding of certain elements into new settlements including: cycle greenways, parking permits to ensure parking is a deterrent, ensure advance green phases for bicycles and the implementation of 'European-style' provision for cycles, pedestrians and disabled people.</p>	<p>(60778) Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties</p>

## **WS/PH: Protection of public houses**

### **Hyperlink for all comments**

Open this hyperlink - [Policy WS/PH: Protection of public houses](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

### **Number of Representations for this section**

15

### **Abbreviations**

- PC= Parish Council      DC= District Council      TC= Town Council

### **Executive Summary**

The majority of respondents expressed support for the policy and the approach to protecting public houses. Support mainly came from Parish Councils. Some comments supporting the policy approach raised that although public houses should be protected, in some circumstances it may not be viable so the policy should allow for their loss. Similarly, one PC suggested the policy should be realistic in its approach if the local community cannot support a public house. However, Cambridge Past, Present & Future suggested the policy could safeguard public houses by nominating them as assets of community value. This was also reflected in other PCs comments regarding the importance of public houses in providing positive impacts and employment opportunities for

communities. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties thought that the policy focus on public houses doesn't reflect the other types of community assets that need safeguarding.

**Table of Representations: WS/PH - Protection of public houses**

<b>Summary of issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed protection of public houses policy.	56640 (Gamlingay PC), 57227 (Abrdn), 57595 (R Pargeter), 57728 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 58217 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail), 58463 (Linton PC), 59933 (Fen Ditton PC), 60016 (Steeple Morden PC), 60092 (Guilden Morden PC)
Policy should be realistic as some communities cannot support a public house.	56758 (Croydon PC)
To help safeguard public houses in the villages, the supporting text to the policy could encourage nominations as assets of community value.	58871 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Support for policy that allows for the loss in some circumstances where public houses are no longer viable.	57227 (Abrdn), 58217 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail)
Condition could be included that if part of the pub is agreed for another use, the marketing policy remains.	60016 (Steeple Morden PC)
Denying permission for change of use will not work unless they can remain financially viable.	57595 (R Pargeter)



<b>Summary of issues raised in comments</b>	<b>Comments highlighting this issue</b>
Sustainable public houses are important as they provide positive impact on village communities.	60414 (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Pubs are important as they offer employment opportunities.	60414 (Great and Little Chishill PC)
The focus on public houses doesn't reflect the diversity of the city, as there are other types of community asset in danger.	60787 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
"Talk the talk, but will they walk the walk?"	59828 (Dry Drayton PC)
No comment.	57421 (Huntingdonshire District Council)