CHAPTER 7: DELIVERING HIGH QUALITY PLACES	
QUESTION NO.	**SUMMARY OF REPS**
QUESTION 28: Securing High Quality Design	
A. Have the right design principles been identified to achieve high quality design in all new developments? Support:37 Object: 1 Comment: 19	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • Support aspiration to deliver high quality development - should reflect and enhance the character of the area in which it is located. • High quality design should be insisted on for all developments. If it is not economic to build subject to the requirements of maintaining our environment, then don't build here. Reject poor design by developers only interested in profit. • Good design is a matter of opinion. • **Natural England** - pleased reference to high quality landscaping and public spaces that provide opportunities for recreation, biodiversity, sustainable drainage and climate change mitigation and protection of trees and other landscape features of amenity and biodiversity value. • Need greater emphasis on integration with existing village through vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access. • Excellent Design Guide which demonstrated the specific character of villages with particular reference to local geology. • **Wildlife Trust** - support inclusion of biodiversity features as a key feature of sustainable design. • Include public art as a design principle. • Good architecture and design – sympathetic design and reasonable housing 'plot' sizes. **OBJECTIONS:** • **Cambridge City Council** – support principle but expect strong, locally-specific design policies – refers to need to fit in with surroundings but silent on what these are (e.g. city fringe, new settlement, rural village). • Local context must be taken into account - guidance should not be so prescriptive as to be contrary to the individual structure of an area. **COMMENTS:** • **Anglian Water** - Site layout should be designed to take into account water mains / sewers infrastructure protected by easements. • Unless you have large sums to spend, choice of house limited to somewhere remote with no pavements, shops, or buses, next to main road, in someone's garden, on former contaminated ground, or live in a sardine can. • Provide guidance – usable open space and amenities, width of roads, unsafe on-street parking important issues to address. • Reverence should be made to Lifetime homes.

	Cambridge Past Present and Future - Joint guidance should be agreed with County Council to ensure quality for urban, suburban and rural highway areas, heritage areas, commons and green spaces where rights of way or cycle routes are proposed. Trees, landscape and historic environment enhanced, not just protected. Local distinctiveness of villages should be preserved. - Opportunity to regulate 'liveaboard' boats - anticipated increasing number of people living on board boats as a form of affordable housing. - Design is not just appearance. Utility is vital. - Housing at Great Kneighton and Trumpington do not convey an impression of quality, or sympathetic integration. **English Heritage** - NPPF – developments should respond to local character and history, reinforce local distinctiveness, and integrate into natural, built and historic environment. - Need to enforce - to make walking and cycling easier, avoid rows of identical boxes, incorporate renewable energy, provide community facilities, improve wildlife and biodiversity. - Consider viability - balance needs to be struck between making desirable at cost to developers in relation to site specific circumstances. **Homes and Communities Agency** - should be supported by study of character of urban areas, produced jointly with neighbouring authorities. - Conservation and planning officers are a law unto themselves - need to be made accountable and have regard to local needs and conditions. - Housing separation should be extended - 40dph is too high, leads to problems of noise, environment and parking problems.
B. Should the Local Plan provide guidance on design of streets to improve the public realm, including minimum street widths and street trees? Support:27 Object: 5 Comment: 13	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** - Density targets are putting pressure on street widths - wider streets prevent congestion, create more pleasant environment, preserve greenery and trees to soften appearance of building facades. Need to specify minimum width. - Streets in housing areas should inhibit movement of cars and encourage cycling and walking and use of public transport. - Examples of good / successful practice in many developments - including in Europe. - Streets need to be wide and inviting, not littered with parked cars, which obstruct emergency vehicles, and street clutter. - Trees vital - enhance streets - appropriate species / location / spacing to reduce nuisance / damage and reduce cost of upkeep. Should be fruit bearing in suitable locations. - Include criteria for (separate) cycleways.

	• Developments should have a practical network of footpaths, without street lights or signs blocking. Should have linked footways separate from cars. • Provision of safe paths or multi-use surfaces. **OBJECTIONS:** • Would be interpreted and enforced by people outside the community not accountable. • Should not impose this. **COMMENTS:** • New road access from M11 to Addenbrookes is great, but design is dangerous as cars shuffle to get in the right lane. • Need policy to strictly enforce approved schemes and preserve them from further alterations. • Guidance street design should be included in District Design Guide rather than Local Plan policy. • Street widths should be assessed on a case by case basis, taking into account the requirements identified e.g. trees, front gardens, parking, cycleways, orientation, views, landscaping, safety, pedestrians, etc. • Guidance on street widths for different functions, use of different surfaces, minimising signage, trees at edge not in middle of paths. • Designating minimum widths denies opportunity for designs to take account of local vernacular required by the NPPF. • Linked to car parking provision – needs to be accommodated on plot and/or roads suitable width / design to accommodate parked cars.
C. Do you think the Council should retain and update the District Design Guide? Support:35 Object: 2 Comment: 12	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • **Cambridge City Council** - Chapter should cover key areas of guidance in Design Guide – more weight. Retain Design Guide and update it from time to time as lessons are learned. Public art should be integrated and remain a requirement. • Provides useful guidance to developers. Without it designs will be experimental. • Must be enforceable against developers and central government pressures. Considering what has been allowed, it must be updated to provide the environment we deserve. • Continue to take account of variation of village character, avoid one size fits all, update periodically to include what is learnt from successes and errors! • Cover all aspects of street scene - minimisation of street clutter - unnecessary/ineffective signage. • It seeks to preserve the local character. • Include impacts of traffic management, parking, street safety, environmental issues etc. **OBJECTIONS:** • Should be created by the village or settlement area. **COMMENTS:**

Summary of Representations to Issues and Options 2012

	• Design of streets should be incorporated into Design Guide rather than in new policy.
	• Needs a good editor to produce a more readable and useful document.
	• Probably - not clear what an alternative might be.
	• Needs updating to take account more modern aspects of design / thinking – moving subject needs regular updating to remain valid.
	• Villages are diverse with all kinds of styles dating from the 15th Century. Fashions change - should be no design guide apart from seeking to prevent bulky buildings destroying harmonious streetscapes. Any attempt to fix fashion is unhelpful.
D. Would you like your village to produce its own design guide? If so, please let us know which village so that we can discuss how to take this forward with the local Parish Council. Support:15 Object: 4 Comment: 16	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • **Barton** • **Cambourne Parish Council** • **Comberton Parish Council** • **Cottenham Parish Council** - Yes, but existing Cottenham Village Design Statement already fulfils many of functions. While this is SPD a specific design guide is not necessary. Other villages should be able to produce their own design guides, to record individual characters. • **Croydon Parish Council** – preparing Parish Plan – likely to be part of it. Parish views on proposed developments ignored. • **Foxton Parish Council** • **Fulbourn Parish Council** - retain District Design Guide and have own design guide within it. • **Great Abington Parish Council** • **Haslingfield Parish Council** - like to examine possibilities of producing own design guide - with particular reference to integration with old buildings. • Parish action plan based on work of parish council ensuring development blends into surrounding area and maintains character of village. • **Highfields Caldecote** • Should be an adjunct to the overall district design guide, but sympathy with local design is essential. • **Histon and Impington Parish Council** – likely to. • **Linton** • **Little Abington Parish Council** - support as a joint venture between The Abingtons (Great and Little), as the villages are abutted. • **Oakington** • **Papworth Everard Parish Council** – assume this would be part of Neighbourhood Plan. • **Steeple Morden Parish Council** - interested if the work and costs for this could be shared with neighbouring Parish Councils. **OBJECTIONS:** • **Caxton Parish Council** – no. • **Fowlmere Parish Council** – no

	Over Parish Council – would not be appropriate. **Weston Colville Parish Council** – not practicable for small villages. **COMMENTS:** **Gamlingay Parish Council** - Importance of local parish Plans/Neighbourhood Plans in mapping local need and providing a central information point on each settlement which could include local design policies and information. - Great Shelford has produced an excellent Design Statement. - Important that Design Guide does not unnecessarily limit innovation and creativity. **Hauxton Parish Council** - More work for parish councillors and clerks! Do small councils have the capacity to take this on? - Villages should be encouraged to produce their own design guide. Understand that Stapleford Parish Council is actively considering doing so. **Litlington Parish Council** – unable to do so at present.
QUESTION 29: Public Art	
What approach do you think the local plan should take on public art? Support:9 Object: 5 Comment: 34	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** - Include as part of design principles and functional elements to provide a sense of place. Encourage as part of high quality design. Helps keep plan concise. - Art works should be acceptable to majority of people and be in keeping with local sensibilities. **Cambridgeshire County Council** - support concept that public art should include the design of functional elements of new buildings. **OBJECTIONS:** - Better use of money, e.g. A14, maintaining open space, cycleways. - Build in discretion and ability to deal with site specific circumstances. Public Art covers a wide range of initiatives and approaches - could result in policy being too precise. - Likely to fail tests Reg 122 of CIL Regs and cannot be required by Condition. Many developments proceed and acceptable without - not necessary or directed related. **COMMENTS:** - Only include if supported by local community. Use competitions to allow people to decide. - Should not be prescriptive of the form it takes. 'Art' in the widest sense, including non-durable and performing art, used to build communities in new developments - successful at Orchard Park. - Design and placement should be determined by parish council. - Foster local artists and where possible integrate into buildings, landscape or street furniture.

	- Should continue to encourage not require, and no more than 1% of construction costs. - Should not be imposed from above, but from local people 'doing their own thing' - planning should provide the places / spaces to facilitate. - Should be functional not ornamental, and secondary to overall excellent design. - Cautious approach! - Plan should not comment on public art. - Not necessary - leave it to parish councils to spend S106 monies if they wish. - Consider viability - balance needs to be struck between making desirable at cost to developers in relation to site specific circumstances. - More likely to be delivered if separate to general design principles - policing compliance would be more easily achieved. - Large-scale can be seen as wasteful and annoying. Small-scale, practical features like signage and seating are generally welcomed - scale is more appropriate for villages. - Rolling programme of public art. Involve schools. Make good use of public buildings for exhibits. Use empty shop fronts to show case local art. Have a county art show. - Be bold. Walter Gropius and Bauhaus at Impington, for example. - Scope for art for arts sake. Contributions from developers could be used to provide facilities in a community centre to deliver arts events (e.g. a stage) rather than just sculptural gates and seats. **Theatres Trust** - Art participation is important leisure pursuit - can be active or passive. Benefits to the individual and community. May not be everyone's taste and can cause vandalism / graffiti. Developments should be designed with bespoke functional elements such as lighting, seating, fencing and water features to provide individuality to otherwise featureless new developments.

Summary of Representations to Issues and Options 2012