

Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy

Paragraphs 2.1 to 2.11: Introductory paragraphs	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 2 Object: 6
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for strategy. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 2.8 indicates phase 1 of Northstowe has planning permission, but the S106 has yet to be signed so this is misleading. • Enforce collaboration between South Cambs and Cambridge and actively work to save green belt areas. • In the plan a completely unrealistic estimate of employment opportunities has been made. The vast majority of people who might live on Bourn Airfield site would be commuting into Cambridge NOT being employed locally. • Evidence base on employment is flawed, need for new employment land on edge of Cambridge (Cambridge South).
Assessment	<p>It is agreed that the reference to the first phase of Northstowe having been granted planning permission in 2013 is not accurate and it was a resolution to grant permission subject to a section 106 agreement. The legal agreement has now been finalised and once signed the planning permission will be issued. A minor modification is proposed to clarify that permission was granted in 2014 which will be the case once the plan is finalised.</p> <p>There has been close cooperation between the Council and Cambridge City Council throughout the plan making process (see Duty to Cooperate below, paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13). Both Councils' plans give significant weight to protecting the Green Belt setting of the historic city. Only limited additional Green Belt releases are proposed (see Policy S/6).</p> <p>The Local Plan does not intend that Bourn Airfield will be self sufficient in jobs. The development strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire aims to locate new homes as close to the main concentration of jobs in and on the edge of the City as possible. Having comprehensively reviewed the Green Belt in the last Cambridge Local Plan and the Local Development Framework, the preparation of this Local Plan has found that new development opportunities on the edge of Cambridge are limited. Developments such as Bourn Airfield close to the outer boundary</p>

	<p>of the Green Belt are the next most sustainable location which will keep to minimum the distances travelled and being a new village will enable good quality bus services to be provided.</p> <p>The employment evidence base is addressed in chapter 8.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend new settlement bullet of paragraph 2.8, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Northstowe – new town of 9,500 homes, first phase of which was granted planning permission in 2013 2014, for 1,500 homes and a development framework plan for the whole new settlement agreed at the same time. It is expected that...’

Duty to Cooperate

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy S/5: Provision of New Jobs and Homes

Paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13: Duty to Cooperate	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 13 Support: 1 Object: 12
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Hertfordshire District Council – No strategic issues requiring detailed discussion. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Bedfordshire Council – Raise potential unmet housing need in the area and the possible role for South Cambridgeshire in accommodating some of that need. Currently intend to meet Gypsy and Traveller need within district, but if cannot would seek to work collaboratively with adjoining districts. • Hertfordshire County Council - Concerned that dialogue regarding transport issues has not taken place and therefore remains concerned about the potential implications of the Local Plan on the Hertfordshire transportation network. • Bourn Parish Council - SCDC did not consult strategically with all relevant local authorities. Views of local people have been ignored. • Papworth Saint Agnes Parish Meeting – Important to work with Huntingdonshire District Council, and other parts of subregion, particularly on transport measures. • Memorandum of Understanding seeks to export Cambridge housing need to Peterborough, which is unsustainable. Not clear how the 2500 extra dwellings can be retrofitted into Peterborough’s plan. Unrealistic that they will deliver sufficient housing. • Cooperation has not resulted in an effective joint strategy. South Cambs has used different employment forecasts from Cambridge City, which impacts significantly on the plan. • Cambridge and South Cambs did not cooperate fully, as South Cambs have not explored all brownfield development opportunities. • No evidence of cooperation on the A14 plans. • SHMA shows no evidence of cooperation with cooperation with Bedford, Hertfordshire or Essex.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to work with surrounding areas when assessing needs.
Assessment	<p>The Council has worked with its neighbours throughout the plan making process. There has been close cooperation with all authorities in the Cambridge sub region housing market area and with Peterborough City Council, whose housing market area overlaps with it. Whilst there has been general cooperation with neighbours outside Cambridgeshire, there is no need for specific cooperation on the Cambridge Sub-Region SHMA with those areas, as they lie within a separate housing market area.</p> <p>A Memorandum of Cooperation agrees that a small part of Fenland and East Cambridgeshire’s identified need in the SHMA will be met in Peterborough. Those homes are already included in the adopted Peterborough Core Strategy that plans for above its own needs. The Local Plan meets the full identified objectively assessed needs for South Cambridgeshire as identified in the SHMA and the Memorandum of Cooperation, as required by the NPPF (see Policy S/5).</p> <p>The Council has worked particularly closely with Cambridge City Council given the functional relationship between the two areas. This includes considering the most appropriate development strategy for the wider Cambridge area. There is no requirement that the Council considers all brownfield land. The plan makes the most of opportunities provided by brownfield sites where they are consistent with achieving a sustainable pattern of development (see Policy S/6).</p> <p>Employment needs of the area have been considered in a coordinated way with the City Council (see chapter 8).</p> <p>The Council has worked closely with the highways authorities. This includes with the County Council on the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy and the accompanying modelling report that support the Local Plan. Close working has and continues to also take place with the Highways Agency on the emerging plans for the A14 improvements, which are important for the delivery of the development strategy, but do not themselves form part of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council does not consider that the points made by Central Bedfordshire Council and Hertfordshire County Council can reasonably be substantiated as a failure to comply with the duty to cooperate and correspondence is ongoing with those councils to seek agreement that they are not pursued as objections under the duty. Furthermore, Cambridgeshire County Council is working closely with Hertfordshire County Council on the Transport</p>

	Strategy.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Joint Spatial Approach to Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy S/4: Cambridge Green Belt; Policy S/5: Provision of New Jobs and Homes and Policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031

Paragraphs 2.14 to 2.17: Joint Spatial Approach to Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 10 Support: 1 Object: 9
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support policies which protect existing village frameworks. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has not been joined up planning. Cambridge city sprawl is being exacerbated by the intention to build on Green Belt sites. There are other options e.g. Barrington Cement Works. • Green Belt development should be the last resort. No reason given why edge of Cambridge is considered most sustainable. • Development at West Cambourne and Bourne Airfield is completely unsustainable. • Green Belt should not be the determinant of planning strategy. Cooperation should have lead to the most sustainable strategy. Does not address imbalance of homes and jobs in Cambridge. Transport strategy has been led by planning strategy rather than the other way round. • A Sustainability Assessment of Harbourne (North of Cambourne) in comparison with Bourn Airfield has not been carried out, the SEA is therefore flawed.
Assessment	<p>There has been close joint working with the City Council, including on the development strategy and the appropriate approach to the focus of development in the Councils' new Local Plans throughout the plan making process. This included coordination of issues forming part of the Councils' first Issues and Options consultations and a joint Part 1 document in the Issues and Options 2 consultation. These were supported by joint evidence documents, such as the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Development Strategy (2012) and the Inner Green Belt Study Review (2012).</p> <p>The review of the development strategy tests the sequence for development and explains why the edge of Cambridge remains the most sustainable location for development in terms of accessibility</p>

	<p>to jobs, services and facilities. The Issues and Options 2 Joint Part 1 consultation specifically asked what the appropriate balance is between the locational merits of the edge of Cambridge and the importance of protecting the Green Belt setting of Cambridge as an important historic city.</p> <p>The transport implications of the different strategy options were tested through transport modelling during the evolution of the development strategy in the Cambridge Sub Regional Transport Modelling Report for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans (2013). This informed the preparation of the development strategy. The sustainability appraisal undertaken jointly by the two Councils informed the conclusion that the accessibility benefits of edge of Cambridge locations do not override the Green Belt importance of the majority of the edge of Cambridge sites, and that new settlements will enable significant transport improvements to be focused on two corridors to deliver high quality public transport and create more sustainable developments than the alternative of development in villages. The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was prepared alongside the Local Plan process and appropriately reflects the development strategy included in the two Local Plans.</p> <p>The joint Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012 identified a small number of areas that could be released from the Green Belt without fundamental harm to its purposes and these areas are proposed to be allocated for development (see Policy S/4). The land north of Cambourne was considered through the SHLAA and tested through the Sustainability Appraisal. It was assessed against the sustainability objectives in the same way as all the other sites considered through the plan making process. All new settlement sites put forward to the SHLAA were shown together in the table contained in Annex B of the Sustainability Appraisal so that their relative performance could be easily compared. The reasons for rejection of the site are also captured in the SHLAA appraisal.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Chapter 10 Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure Policy TI/2: Planning for Sustainable Travel.

Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.19: The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 17 Support: 3 Object: 14
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council - The development strategy set out in the Local Plans, with growth primarily focused on Cambridge, Waterbeach Barracks, West Cambourne and Bourn Airfield leads to more sustainable transport patterns overall than options with more dispersed growth across South Cambridgeshire. • Highways Agency - The evidence reviewed to date gives some level of comfort and it is recognised that a lot of work has been undertaken to consider local and strategic transport impacts, as well as identify potential schemes that could address these impacts. Noted that there is currently a significant funding shortfall. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage – Transport infrastructure could be damaging to the historic environment. Status of the transport plan should be clarified. Should make commitment to consider impact on historic environment, and seek enhancement. • Harlton Parish Council – Inadequate links in the plan to the transport plan. • Transport strategy only published with the submission plan. Decision to build homes was made without a strategy in place. • Only assesses the scope to mitigate transport implications of plan content. Does not assess scope to deliver good transport. • Green Belt development exacerbates road problems in Cambridge. • Edge of Cambridge sites have better transport options than Bourn Airfield, and result in better modal share of cycling and walking. • Need more investment in Cycle lanes. • Large funding gap for transport measures proposed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence base in respect of highway and traffic impact is incomplete. No transport modelling of concentrating development on edge of Cambridge. Decisions taken in advance of testing the impacts of the strategy. • Strategy fails to take account of existing transport infrastructure e.g. at Trumpington. • No evidence to demonstrate Bourn Airfield is more sustainable than Cambourne North proposal.
Assessment	<p>There has been close working with the County Council on transport matters throughout the plan making process. The transport implications of the different strategy options were tested through transport modelling during the evolution of the development strategy in Cambridge Sub Regional Transport Modelling Report for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans (2013). This informed the preparation of the development strategy.</p> <p>The modeling identified that the main transport impacts will be as a result of existing patterns of development and planned developments in adopted plans. It is only the additional development that the plan can influence. The benefits of edge of Cambridge locations in terms of accessibility have always been acknowledged but when weighed against the significant Green Belt harm identified and tested through the sustainability appraisal, it was concluded that land on the edge of Cambridge should not be identified for development as part of the strategy included in the plan.</p> <p>The modelling looked at the relative performance of new settlements compared with dispersed village development. The focus of housing in new settlements on two corridors provides opportunities to deliver high quality public transport improvements. This will create sustainable developments with far higher mode shares by non car modes than more dispersed development (the modelling shows 6-7% in new settlements compared with 2% through village focused development). This supports the plan focus for the additional element of the development strategy being through strategic scale developments focused on key corridors with more limited rural development.</p> <p>The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was prepared alongside the Local Plan process and appropriately reflects the development strategy included in the two Local Plans.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Comparing the Development Strategy to 2031 with the Structure Plan

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031.

Comparing the Development Strategy to 2031 with the Structure Plan (Paragraphs 2.20 and 2.23)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 5 Support: 2 Object: 3
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steady increase in homes in built up areas welcomed. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear how much development is in Green Belt, or on Previously Developed Land. Tables illustrating comparison with structure plan double count the same urban extensions.
Assessment	<p>The Local Plan strategy makes best use of available brownfield land in suitable locations as part of a sustainable development strategy. No specific calculation is included. It is recognised that in a largely rural area the availability of brownfield land is limited and some such sites are remote from services and facilities. A number of the strategic development sites include significant areas of brownfield land, including the new settlements at Northstowe, Waterbeach Barracks and Bourn Airfield.</p> <p>The tables provide an appropriate comparison of previous and new spatial strategies taking each version of the strategy as a whole.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy S/1: Vision

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 1	Vision
Issues and Options Approaches	<p>The consultation proposed to use the Council's corporate vision for the Local Plan: <i>South Cambridgeshire will continue to be the best place to live and work in the country. Our district will demonstrate impressive and sustainable economic growth. Our residents will have a superb quality of life in an exceptionally beautiful, rural and green environment.</i></p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>N/A The objectives are intended to help achieve the vision.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Support: 71, Object: 23, Comment: 39</p> <p>Issues and Options 1 - General Comments on the plan (chapter 1): 43 Issues and Options 2 Part 2 - General Comments on the plan (chapter 1): 24 Issues and Options 2 Part 2 - General Comments on the plan (chapter 1): 128</p> <p>Questionnaire Comments on: Questions 8 Local Services: 647 Questions 9 Quality of Life: 675 Questions 10 Further Comments: 525</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impressive economic growth is incompatible with environmental quality • More focus should be made on sustainable growth, and efficient use of natural resources • A sub-regional approach to planning for South Cambs is needed • Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the proposed growth • Vision and objectives are contradicted by proposals later in the I&O paper • Protect the rural nature of the district • Replace "the best place to live", with "one of the best" • Vision should be more specific and less subjective (e.g. how do you assess "superb quality of life") • Support high economic growth • More homes are needed to support strong economic growth <p>Wide range of general issues in response to questionnaires, which have been noted. Many addressed by issues elsewhere in the audit trail and the subsequent local plan. Many responses address matters not addressed by the Local Plan.</p>

Preferred Approach and Reasons	Retain the Council's corporate vision as the Vision for the Local Plan. Representations expressed support for more homes and strong economic growth, but concern about the compatibility of growth with maintaining environmental quality. It will be the role of the plan to balance the three aspects of sustainability – social, economic, and environmental. Many of the comments concerned approaches to the plan rather than the vision specifically. How the vision is implemented is addressed by objectives, and subsequently by policies and proposals.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy S/1: Vision
Policy S/1: Vision (and Paragraphs 2.24 and 2.25)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 12 Support: 7 Object: 5
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Hertfordshire District Council - overarching vision of your plan seems to be well considered. • Environment Agency – Support vision of a green environment • Natural England – Generally welcome this section. • Important to balance demands of development with the quality of existing environment. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'continue to be the best place to live, work and study' is a subjective statement. • Growth can never be sustainable given planet of finite resources. Should not be trying to get more people to live here. • Development strategy west of Cambridge conflicts with the vision. • Plan will not provide sufficient support for high tech industries. Vision should refer to meeting the need for development for continued economic and social success of district.
Assessment	The Vision reflects the Council's corporate vision for the district. Part of the vision is to provide sustainable economic growth. How that is achieved is a matter for other parts of the plan.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy S/2: Objectives of the Local Plan

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 2	Objectives
Issues and Options Approaches	The Issues and Options Report proposed a set of 6 objectives that the Local Plan would aim to achieve.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	N/A
Representations Received	Support:75, Object:11, Comment:50
Key Issues from Representations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic development should not take precedence over environmental limits • Support for or request for more integration with neighbouring authorities • Proposals in the Plan contradict the objectives • Ensure that all development has sufficient infrastructure including transport • Development should have access to services (shops etc) • Protect the rural character of the district • Objectives are bland/vague • Yes, but in the past these proposals have not been delivered • Support agriculture • Link new development to transport
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include all 6 objectives in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Add to objective b, 'as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt.'</p> <p>Add reference to 'sustainable locations' in objective c.</p> <p>Revise objective e to read, 'To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.'</p> <p>As with the vision, the main concerns which come through the comments is the compatibility of the vision and objectives with high levels of employment and housing development and securing the timely provision of services and infrastructure. Other issues include achieving a diverse economy, not just high tech, and coordinating with neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>A number of specific wording changes were suggested, but the objectives are considered sound, and sufficiently broad that many more detailed issues could be addressed by subsequent sections of the plan.</p>

	<p>In recognition of its importance, reference to protection of the Green Belt has been added to the objectives of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The objective regarding transport has been amended to include rail, as suggested in a number of representations.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy S/2: Objectives of the Local Plan
Policy S/2: Objectives of the Local Plan (and Paragraph 2.26)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 116</p> <p>Support: 65</p> <p>Object: 51</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency – Support objectives, particularly b. • Natural England – Welcome policies which seek to ensure that development will protect and enhance the natural environment • Sound objectives which will benefit current and future residents. • New developments must take into account the community that is already in place. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Should reference meeting infrastructure needs of existing communities as well as new developments. • Bourn Parish Council - SCDC has been inconsistent in its response to consultation feedback and has failed to capture local aspirations in the draft Local Plan. Fails to deliver the localism agenda. • Objectives should highlight role of previously developed sites. • Objectives not met by Bourn Airfield. <p><u>Objective A</u></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports South Cambs' strengths. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should reference making land available for these industries. <p><u>Objective B</u></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife Trust – support • Built and natural heritage should be protected.

	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage – should reference the historic Environment. • Protecting the Green Belt should have its own objective. • Local Plan does not protect the Green Belt. • Should emphasise that development should enhance the character of the area. • West Cambourne and Bourn airfield will not achieve this objective. • Encouragement should be given to developing previously developed land. <p><u>Objective C</u></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need affordable housing. • Sustainability is the key word. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will not be met as insufficient development is planned in villages. It unnecessarily constrains development in sustainable villages. • Fails to consider inter-dependency between villages. • Will not deliver sufficient sites in sustainable locations i.e. the edge of Cambridge. • West Cambourne and Bourn airfield will not achieve this objective. • Should refer to meeting identified housing requirements. <p><u>Objective D</u></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support objective to deliver high quality. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should support the delivery of renewable energy • Seek more variety of homes, more parking, larger gardens <p><u>Objective E</u></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council - the location of new development in relation to services and facilities is important in ensuring jobs and key services are available to all. • Important. New development should not be built if it places a strain on facilities. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – include libraries in list of facilities. • RSPB – add word 'appropriate' before local open space and
--	---

	<p>green infrastructure, accompanied by an explanation in the supporting text that open and green space should be appropriately planned to avoid indirect recreational disturbance impacts to sites of importance for nature conservation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should refer to existing development as well as new development. • Should refer to pubs. • Facilities in Cambourne are full. <p><u>Objective F</u> Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An important consideration. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add horse riding. • Dispersal strategy of the plan will not meet this objective. • Bourn Airfield and Cambourne have no public transport provision. Focus development where there are the best transport links. • Employment sites in Cambourne have been removed.
Assessment	<p>It is important that objectives for the Local Plan are high level and aspirational, and focus on the goal to be achieved. A number of representors seek changes which suggest policy approaches. How the objectives are achieved, such as through specific policy measures, is addressed elsewhere in the plan. As such no changes are necessary.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy S/3: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 8	Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
Key evidence	South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD: ST/3 Re-Using Previously Developed Land and Buildings • Development Control Policies DPD: DP/1 Sustainable Development
Analysis	<p>The NPPF refers to the United Nations General Assembly's widely used definition of sustainable development as 'meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'. It also refers to the UK Sustainable Development Strategy's 5 guiding principles. It states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Local Plans are required to meet objectively assessed needs with sufficient flexibility to response to rapid change and to follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development that is sustainable can be approved without delay.</p> <p>The three strands of sustainability are all addressed throughout the issues and options for the Local Plan and sustainable development is an overarching principle underpinning the plan.</p> <p>The Council's integrated approach to sustainability appraisal and policy assessment has also been adopted so that sustainability considerations are at the heart of the plan.</p> <p>A particular aspect of sustainable development not captured elsewhere is the reuse of previously developed land. The NPPF says that planning policies should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. It says that local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has a policy for brownfield land that includes a target. However, that policy was included specifically because the Structure Plan included a target for each district in the County. The Council argued at the time of the Structure Plan that it is difficult to</p>

	<p>set a target for South Cambridgeshire given the relatively limited number of brownfield land sites and that those that were included for development such as Cambridge Airport and Oakington Barracks (part of the Northstowe site) were very much dependent on the phasing of major developments and which parts of those long term developments would come forward in the plan period and which beyond. The same principle applies for the new Local Plan. It is therefore not considered reasonable to include a target in the plan, given the uncertainty of delivery of previously developed land against such a target. The local plan could include a policy that focuses development on previously developed land as a matter of principle, where it is not of high environmental value, and bringing that together with the presumption in favour of sustainable development to say that reuse of PDL should be where it is in sustainable locations.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: It is not considered reasonable to include any alternative options, given the pre-eminence of sustainable development in national planning policy, other than in the case of whether to have a specific policy on previously developed land.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>

Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 8: Do you think the Local Plan should include a specific policy focusing development on the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, where the land is not of high environmental value?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Primary goal of policy would be to seek to re-use previously developed land, it would therefore have potential to contribute significantly to the achievement of the land objective, although it is noted in the Scoping Report that previously developed land opportunities in the district are relatively limited. References to sustainable locations indicate a positive impact on the sustainable transport objective, and accessibility to services. Reference to 'not of high environmental value' also indicates biodiversity issue would be taken into account. Whether such principles are in a standalone policy, or a general sustainable development policy is largely a procedural matter.
Representations Received	Support:105; Object:11; Comment:27
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously developed land should be the priority/ greenfield minimised; • Preference should be to preserve employment sites / Development should be focused on under utilised employment sites • No review of Green Belt. • Be realistic that most development will have to happen on Greenfield sites. • Old airfields should not be regarded as "brownfield", especially if an old airfield has been used for agriculture since it ceased to be an airfield. • Policy should not be used to enable garden grabbing. • Need to define 'of high environmental value' • Cambridge City Council - concerned that this issue does not provide sufficient coverage of the issue of sustainable development, which is a much broader concept, encompassing a range of environmental, social and economic aspects in order to achieve the greatest benefits for South Cambridgeshire. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not override the principles of sustainable location. • There should not be a 'brownfield land first' presumption due to the need for a high level of greenfield releases to meet development needs from the start of the plan period. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already in NPPF, no need to repeat principle in the Local Plan, unless the proposed policy is distinctive to South Cambridgeshire. • Reasonable idea, unless it leads to communities being merged

	<p>together in a run of housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not solely for housing developments, it should be consulted locally to see what are the local needs • Also consider low grade agricultural land • Availability of infrastructure must be considered and the effect on local villages • Brownfield land suitable for re-development should be defined and identified. • For the plan to stipulate brownfield sites should be prioritised for all forms of development could prohibit future renewable energy developments. • The only sustainable development is no development. • Previously developed land could still be inappropriate for residential development. • The Wildlife Trust - welcomes the recognition that brownfield land can be of high environmental value.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>The NPPF makes clear that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The UK Sustainable Development Strategy sets out five guiding principles of sustainable development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living within the planet’s environmental limits; • Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; • Achieving a sustainable economy; • Promoting good governance; and • Using sound science responsibility. <p>At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which it says should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking.</p> <p>Policy S/1 responds to the comments that the policy should be more widely framed and that in the circumstances of South Cambridgeshire in terms of levels of development required and availability of brownfield land, that greenfield land will also be required to meet needs. However, the principle of focusing development on brownfield land where available and suitable is a principle that has influenced the Local Plan strategy and policies.</p> <p>The policy is drawn from the National Planning Policy Framework and the model sustainable development policy provided by the Planning Inspectorate for inclusion within all local plans. This policy, alongside the other policies contained within the draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, will ensure that all new development in the district meets the principles of sustainable development.</p>

Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy S/3: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
---	--

Policy S/3: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development (and Paragraph 2.27)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 30 Support: 22 Object: 8
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for sustainable development. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council - agrees that future development should focus on re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, where land is not of high environmental value, but needs to be clearer when brownfield site is predominantly farm land. • Policy could be used as a lever for inappropriate development. Should clarify only applies when proposals conform to local plan and its objectives. • Does not fully reflect NPPF paragraph 12, that applications for planning permission that conflict with an up-to-date plan should be refused. • Policy adds additional caveats to NPPF paragraph 14 which should be deleted. It refers to "material considerations indicate otherwise" - not part of NPPF test. Two tests in NPPF will be "[taken] into account", suggesting importance will be downplayed. • Policy should also include a commitment to approve planning applications without delay, so as to be consistent with proposed policy for the Cambridge Local Plan. • Development should always be sustainable. The wrong sites have been chosen in the plan.
Assessment	<p>The policy is drawn from the National Planning Policy Framework and the model sustainable development policy provided by the Planning Inspectorate for inclusion within all local plans. This policy, alongside the other policies contained within the draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, will ensure that all new development in the district meets the principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole, and this policy will be considered alongside all the other policies in the plan.</p> <p>Reference to 'unless material considerations indicate otherwise'</p>

	<p>forms part of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and is a key consideration when assessing plan applications. It is therefore reasonable that it is referenced in the policy.</p> <p>Reference to applications being determined without delay is superfluous.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Policy S/4: Cambridge Green Belt

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 10	Green Belt
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Green Belt Study - Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002 • Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD: ST/1 Green Belt • Development Control Policies DPD: GB/1 Development in the Green Belt
Analysis	<p>The NPPF says that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.</p> <p>Five purposes for Green Belts are set out, the key one for the Cambridge Green Belt being: “To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns”. The Cambridge Green Belt is one of the few to which this criteria applies. The purposes and functions of the Cambridge Green Belt are intended to help achieve the preservation of the setting of Cambridge and its special character.</p> <p>The Core Strategy DPD sets out the established purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. It also draws on the Cambridge Green Belt Study by LDA for the Council in setting out a number of functions of the Green Belt as it affects South Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>The established purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre; • Maintain and enhance the quality of its setting; and • Prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the city. <p>The current plan also sets out a number of functions that the Cambridge Green Belt serves. These could be carried forward to the new Local Plan They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key views of Cambridge from the surrounding countryside; • A soft green edge to the city; • A distinctive urban edge; • Green corridors penetrating into the city; • Designated sites and other features contributing positively to the character of the landscape setting;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages; • A landscape which retains a strong rural character. <p>These were tested through the last plan making process and found sound. The Council considers they remain a sound definition of the Green Belt purposes and functions. However, in the issues & Options consultation was an opportunity to consult widely to confirm whether these are remain the most appropriate for the new Local Plan.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: No alternatives were identified, but given the significance of the Green Belt, it was relevant to consult on whether there was any case to change the purposes and functions of the Green Belt.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 10: Do you think that the Green Belt purposes and functions remain appropriate for the new Plan?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Green Belt functions and purposes of the Green Belt are primarily focused on landscape and townscape setting.
Representations Received	Support: 89; Object: 15; Comment: 39
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The functions of the Green Belt remain appropriate for the new Local Plan. • Green Belt is essential to identity and character of Cambridge, quality of life. • Green Belt boundaries should not be reviewed further. • Protects agricultural land, supports recreation, maintains separation of settlements, prevents urban sprawl. • The Local Plan should address Green Belt landscape enhancement and be made accessible. • The compact nature of Cambridge is one of the reasons that Cambridge is easy for walking and cycling. • Needs to be reviewed on a regular basis, cannot be regarded as sacrosanct. • Once established it should not be reviewed. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not consistent with PPG2, and NPPF. • Many of the suggested purposes and functions of the Green Belt stated are more related to landscape quality issues and

	<p>are not directly related to Green Belt. Many areas of the Green Belt do not perform any of these functions. The Plan must distinguish between these issues and the purposes and functions of the Green Belt should be consistent with the NPPF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outdoor sport and recreation should also identified as a function of the Green Belt around Cambridge. • Green Belt purposes and functions should not restrict development at the expense of other factors, such as village amenity and open space. • Purpose and functions not suitable as Green Belt review is needed to meet development needs. • The area of the Green Belt needs to be expanded significantly, with more safeguarding from development and promotion of biodiversity. • The Wildlife Trust – Purposes are insufficient, an additional key purpose for the Cambridge Green Belt should be to provide a wildlife-rich environment and high quality green infrastructure that makes a significant contribution to the enhancement of our natural environment and biodiversity and the delivery of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review may be necessary to meet housing needs. • Should be retained in all but exceptional circumstances. • The potential for wind energy generation in the Green Belt should also be considered and provided for in the Local Plan. • They need careful scrutiny - e.g. preserving Cambridge as a compact city runs up against the expansion needed because of its success. How big is compact? • English Heritage - The purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt set out are appropriate and true to those in the NPPF, in previous national policy in PPG2 and in the original ambitions for the Green Belt when it was designated. It will be helpful to set these out clearly in policy since the purpose of protecting the character and setting of Cambridge is quite distinct from the role of other Green Belt containing metropolitan areas. The function of maintaining a connection between the historic core and the surrounding landscape through relative proximity could also be added. The Landscape Design Associates Green Belt Study (2003) refers to the way in which short distances between the urban edge, gateways and the historic centre help to define, and allow appreciation of the identity of Cambridge as a historic city. • Environment Agency – In addition, the areas of green belt around Cambridge and its neighbouring settlements can form a 'strategic green infrastructure linkage'. By this we mean
--	--

	<p>linkages of a significant nature and on a strategic scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England - would welcome an approach which seeks to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt by providing opportunities for outdoor sports and recreation, increasing access, improvements and enhancements to visual amenity and biodiversity.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>The NPPF sets out five purposes for Green Belts, the key one for the Cambridge Green Belt being: “to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns”. The purposes and functions of the Cambridge Green Belt have been established in previous Local Plans and are intended to help achieve the preservation of the setting of Cambridge and its special character. The Council considers they remain sound and this is supported by the comments received during the Issues & Options consultation.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purposes and functions of the Green Belt included in the adopted Local Development Framework and that were subject to consultation are consistent with the five national purposes of the Green Belt included in the NPPF. • Although the Green Belt includes areas that are used for outdoor sport and recreation, these are not functions of the Green Belt; instead they are appropriate development that can be allowed in the Green Belt as stated in the NPPF. The functions of the Green Belt describe how the purposes of the Green Belt will be achieved, but do not specify the particular uses. The Green Belt designation does not prevent these uses from occurring in the Green Belt – the draft Local Plan in Chapter 8 includes a policy encouraging increased or enhanced opportunities for access to the open countryside and which provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation in the Green Belt. • The Council is committed to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and will work with partners to ensure a proactive approach to protection, enhancement and management of biodiversity identified in national and local strategies and plans such as Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) and the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy. Policies for biodiversity and green infrastructure are included in Chapter 8 of the draft Local Plan. • The local character and distinctiveness of the landscape across the district will be protected by a policy for the protection and enhancement of landscape character throughout the district included in Chapter 8 of the draft Local Plan. • The Green Belt provides an additional level of protection to retain the openness and permanence of the landscape

	<p>around Cambridge and the necklace villages surrounding the city that fall within the Green Belt. Many of the purposes and functions of the Green Belt can therefore also be seen as purposes and functions of other areas of countryside within the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A criteria based policy for renewable and low energy developments is included in the Climate Change chapter of the draft Local Plan and the draft Local Plan includes a series of Green Belt policies. Any wind energy proposals in the Green Belt would need to comply with these policies. Additionally, the NPPF states that elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development when located in the Green Belt. Therefore, in such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed, and these very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy S/4: Cambridge Green Belt
Policy S/4: Cambridge Green Belt (and Paragraphs 2.28 to 2.33)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 220 Support: 70 Object: 150</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – Welcome this policy. • English Heritage - supports the commitment to ensuring that the setting and special character of Cambridge is protected. • Harlton PC, Barton PC, Fulbourn PC – support for continuation of protection of the Green Belt. • Fen Ditton PC – Green Belt in and around village should remain. • Haslingfield PC - Should be no further encroachment into Green Belt to west of Hauxton Road on either side of M11. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Green Belt land should not be used for development. • Green belt land needs to be protected, important for character of the City and the economy. • Should be no development in the Green Belt around Fen Ditton. • Should be protected around Fulbourn. • Support the retention in the Green Belt of the small parcel of land in Home End, Fulbourn. • Development should only be in exceptional circumstances.

	<p>Support conclusion that community stadium does not provide this exception at Trumpington Meadows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the extension of the Green Belt between Waterbeach village and the New Town site. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Shelford PC – pleased that no sites identified around village, but policy should be strengthened to provide greater protection. • Wildlife Trust – Object to lack of emphasis on enhancement of the Green Belt. • Policy needs to be elaborated on to present a more positive context. • Save the Cambridge Green Belt - No further development in the Green Belt. Petition of 2,242 signatures requests that both South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Councils withdraw all sites in Green Belt proposed in the Plans. . • Exceptional circumstances to review the Green Belt do not exist because alternative sites are available. • Plan will cause urban sprawl, merging villages with Cambridge. • Make use of Brownfield before using Green Belt. Council has not searched for all available sites before proposing Green Belt development. • The use of criteria based on quality or value against which to assess sites is not supported by the NPPF. • No clear and compelling case presented as to why the Impington site has been selected for development. • Further development between Huntingdon and Histon Roads will compromise separation to Girton. • Use poor greenbelt between NIAB and the A14 to a much greater extent that proposed • The purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt should be changed to accord with those in the NPPF: • Choose the best sites to build new developments regardless of the green belt. • Green Belt has been incorrectly treated as an absolute constraint. • Insufficient evidence that impact on sustainability has been considered when reviewing the Green Belt. • No Green Belt review carried out for the rural area. • Review is needed if sustainability objectives are to be met, and critical supporting infrastructure to the city is to be delivered. • Green Belt boundary in the plan will not offer permanence due to future development needs. A proper safeguarding assessment has not been undertaken. • Safeguarded land should be available for development, and
--	---

	<p>the airport is not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Airport should be returned to the Green Belt. Can be reassessed if becomes available in the future. • WATERBEACH – Objection to Proposed extension to Green Belt north of Bannold Road. Land does not contribute to Green Belt purposes. Barracks are already linked to village by built development. No mention of Green Belt at Issues and options, which identified sites with development potential. <p>Edge of Cambridge Green Belt strategic objection sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAMBRIDGE SOUTH – Development could take place without significant harm to the purpose of including land in the Green Belt. Hauxton Road, the M11 and the River Cam corridor would provide boundaries that will endure and be permanent. • CAMBRIDGE SOUTH EAST – Review green belt to facilitate development. • LAND NORTH OF BARTON ROAD – Land previously released on edge of Cambridge equally sensitive in landscape terms. Remove from Green Belt and allocate for development. • LAND TO SOUTH OF BARTON ROAD – Land previously released on edge of Cambridge equally sensitive in landscape terms. Remove from Green Belt and safeguard for development after 2031. • LAND WEST OF HAUXTON ROAD, TRUMPINGTON - should be released from the Green Belt, and along with land at the Abbey Stadium, Newmarket Road (in Cambridge City Council's area) be allocated to meet the need for new homes and sports facilities. Needed to deliver critical infrastructure identified in supporting studies. • FEN DITTON - Land should be released from Green Belt to accommodate development. <p>Other Green Belt objection sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BABRAHAM RESEARCH CAMPUS - capacity to deliver new specialist research and development floorspace at Babraham. Land should be removed from Green Belt. • GIRTON – Girton College should be released from the Green Belt. • GIRTON - South side of Huntingdon Rd – area no longer performs green belt functions (also seeking change to Development Framework). • GIRTON - Land at Howes Close/Whitehouse Lane - should be released from the Green Belt and allocated to meet Anglia Ruskin's need for student residential accommodation. Can be development without significant
--	---

	<p>impact on approach to City.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GREAT ABINGTON - Former A11/A505 junction area – should be reviewed to correct historic anomaly. • GREAT SHELFORD – Scotsdales – Does not warrant Green Belt status (also seeking change to Development Framework). • HARSTON - Land at Royston Road – Green Belt does not follow natural boundaries. • HARSTON - Harston south west area - bounded by River Rhee, Haslingfield Road / Church Street and Mill Road, infilling will not impact on Green Belt principles (also seeking change to Development Framework). • HARSTON – North of Haslingfield Road – builders yard should be removed from Green Belt (also seeking change to Development Framework). • HARSTON - Button End – existing development forms part of the village (also seeking change to Development Framework). • HORNINGSEA - Notcutts Garden Centre site – Does not warrant Green Belt status (also seeking change to Development Framework). • LITTLE ABINGTON - land beside old A11 – Land does not perform Green Belt purposes. • MILTON - Land East of A14 Milton Interchange - site does not significantly meet the key functions of the Green Belt. • WHITTLESFORD - Wren Park – remove boundary anomaly. • WHITTLESFORD – Syngenta – Remove employment area from Green Belt, and include as Established Employment Area. <p>Proposals also seeking Housing Allocation at policy H/1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FULBOURN - Land at Court Meadows House off Balsham Road (SHLAA 213) • FULBOURN land off Home End (SHLAA 214) – circumstances have changed since site was designated as Green Belt. • GREAT SHELFORD - Land south of Great Shelford Caravan and Camping Club, Cambridge Road (SHLAA 188) – Disagree with the Councils assessment. • GREAT SHELFORD - Land east of Hinton Way, north of Mingle Lane (SHLAA 207) – Disagree with the Councils assessment. • GREAT SHELFORD - Land off Cambridge Road (SHLAA 005). Studies have shown area could be removed from Green Belt. • HARSTON - Land to the rear of 98 - 102 High Street (SHLAA 266) – Site not visible from the wider landscape.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HISTON - Buxhall Farm (SHLAA 113) – Needed to accommodate development, SHLAA suggested site was not constrained. • HISTON - Land to the West of 113 Cottenham Road (SHLAA 306) – development would not have adverse impact. • HISTON - Boundary change north of Impington Lane (Policy H/1 D) – Councils alteration is illogical as it does not follow physical features. Should allocate a larger area.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>The policy has been carried forward largely unchanged from the Adopted Core Strategy DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. A specific function of the Cambridge Green Belt is to preserve the setting and special character of Cambridge as a historic town.</p> <p>General Objections:</p> <p>Strength of the policy – Government attaches great importance to Green Belts and sets out strong policy guidance for them in the NPPF which does not need to be repeated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>NPPF and Green Belt purposes – The stated purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt are consistent with those in the NPPF and have been derived from and included in a series of plans including the 1992 Cambridge Green Belt Local Plan (which itself drew on studies and reports going back to the 1930's), the 2003 Structure Plan, past Regional Planning Guidance and the adopted Core Strategy, all of which have been previously tested at examination. A common theme has been the importance of the Green Belt to the setting and special character of Cambridge as a historic city which includes the quality of its rural setting, necklace villages, important views, green corridors, and soft green edge. In carrying out a review of the inner boundary of the Green Belt it is entirely appropriate that visual quality be considered to assist judgements to be reached concerning the significance and importance of land to the Cambridge Green Belt. The 2012 Inner Green Belt Boundary Study provides a robust assessment to inform plan making.</p> <p>Enhancement – Policy guidance on the enhancement of the Green Belt is set out in the NPPF. Policy SS/2 in the Local Plan requires such enhancement on land retained in the Green Belt. Similar policies are to be found in the retained Area Action Plans for the Cambridge Southern Fringe and Cambridge East.</p> <p>Development in the Green Belt and exceptional circumstances – The NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances through the preparation of a</p>

	<p>Local Plan, and that in considering the case for alterations account should be taken of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. Development in the urban area of Cambridge and on the edge of Cambridge in the Green Belt are the most sustainable locations for development in terms of accessibility to jobs and services and reducing emissions. However, the Green Belt immediately surrounding Cambridge also has an important environmental role in terms of historic heritage and protection of the setting and special character of Cambridge as a historic town, which is also important for sustainability. Given the need for jobs and homes in the area, it follows that if land on the edge of Cambridge and in Green Belt villages can be identified where the impacts of development on Green Belt purposes would be limited, then exceptional circumstances would exist to justify their release. The Council has not treated Green Belt as an absolute constraint, and indeed proposes some releases of land from the Green Belt for development, weighing in each case the sustainability merits of such locations with the significance of harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.</p> <p>A study of the Inner Boundary of the Green Belt was undertaken in 2012 by Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Councils which identified a number of small sites on the edge of Cambridge that could be released for development with limited impact on Green Belt purposes. The 2012 study also found that large scale strategic development on the edge of Cambridge would have major adverse impacts on Green Belt purposes. The negative impacts of such developments on the environment in terms of the setting of Cambridge are considered to outweigh their economic, social and other environmental benefits as explained in the Sustainability Appraisal. Alternative development locations for strategic scales of development have been identified beyond the outer boundary of the Green Belt. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans include proposals for development of the land identified in the Green Belt Study Review, which for South Cambridgeshire are an employment allocation on Fulbourn Road adjacent to the Peterhouse Technology Park and a slightly larger site at NIAB3 (land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road). See also Policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031.</p> <p>A number of Green Belt sites at villages were also identified through the SHLAA where development would have limited impact on Green Belt purposes. This took account of the need for a robust and flexible development strategy with an element of village as well as strategic scale housing sites, and the fact that most of the largest and better served villages are located in the Green Belt. This also comprises exceptional circumstances. See</p>
--	--

	<p>Policy H/1: Housing Sites in Villages.</p> <p>Urban sprawl and village merger – The small sites identified for release will not produce urban sprawl or lead to the merger of villages to Cambridge.</p> <p>Use brownfield land first – The Sustainability Appraisal of sites has prioritised the development of brownfield land over greenfield sites where it is in appropriate locations and can contribute towards sustainable development. However, in a rural area without any significant urban areas a high proportion of greenfield development cannot be avoided. To identify potential development sites, and in advance of the publication of the draft guidance in the NPPG, the Council primarily relied on a Call for Sites (which yielded around 300 sites), which was backed up by a review of all potential development locations on the edge of Cambridge, as this lies at the top of the development sequence. A large number of additional sites across the district have been proposed in representations to the Issues and Options consultations and to the Proposed Submission Local Plan. It is considered that all reasonable options have been considered and it is very unlikely that any deliverable development sites have not thereby been considered. Overall the evidence base relating to potential development sites is considered to be adequate and proportionate.</p> <p>Use of criteria in assessments – The NPPF does not rule out the approach followed to assess sites in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Impington site – The Council has concluded that exceptional circumstances do exist to justify the release of sites for development as discussed above. The SHLAA concludes that a smaller site can be developed, with limited impact on Green Belt purposes. A new defensible boundary will be created.</p> <p>Girton separation – The Inner Green Belt boundary study 2012 and the SHLAA assessment find that development in this location if set back from the road would have a limited impact on Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>Safeguarding – There is no requirement in the NPPF that safeguarded land should be available for development. The NPPF says that plans can identify areas of safeguarded land between an urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period and make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time and can only come forward following a review of the Local Plan. The adopted plans for</p>
--	--

	<p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire include Cambridge East as a key element of the sustainable development strategy. Whilst the airport site is now not available for the plan period to 2031, the landowner has supported the safeguarding of the land. It is appropriate in the circumstances that the land previously removed from the Green Belt as not being essential to Green Belt purposes, but not available to meet development needs for the new plan period, is safeguarded for possible longer term development. The role of the land in a future development strategy for the Cambridge area can then be assessed in future plan reviews.</p> <p>NIAB land – The Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2012 concludes that major development in this location beyond that identified in the Local Plan would have significant adverse impacts on Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>Bannold Road Waterbeach – Paragraph 82 of the NPPF allows for new Green Belt to be established in exceptional circumstances such as when planning for new settlements. At Issues and Options stage no decision had been reached on the form and scale of the Waterbeach development.</p> <p>Local representations strongly support the separation of the existing village and the new town. If the sites are not given protection as Green Belt normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate to maintain their open character given their location and their suitability for residential development. Short term housing development on a small village scale should not be allowed which would compromise the success and sustainability of a strategic new town development which will help meet the housing needs of the District over a period extending beyond the plan period.</p> <p>The SHLAA assessment of site 155 concerning land north of Bannold Road, quotes an appeal decision from 1985 dismissing a small development in this location stating: “[The site] is separated from Waterbeach Barracks by a strip of arable land only some 200m wide and the Barracks itself is as extensive as a large village. It seems to me highly desirable that a wedge of open land should be retained between the 2 settlements to prevent their coalescence”.</p> <p>The long standing importance attached to the retention of a wedge of open land between Waterbeach village and the New Town remain relevant to the proposed designation of the land as Green Belt.</p>
--	---

	<p>Edge of Cambridge Green Belt strategic objection sites: Main issues and assessments of these sites, including Green Belt issues, are contained in Annex A.</p> <p>Other Green Belt objection sites: The NPPF is clear that the general extent of Green Belts is already established and should only be altered in exceptional circumstances - none of the following sites have demonstrated exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Babraham Research Campus, Girton College & Syngenta – It is not unusual to have areas of built development within the Green Belt. Being located within the Green Belt does not preclude appropriate development. Proposals can be considered through the planning application process as to whether site specific issues warrant exceptional circumstances within the Green Belt. The Green Belt boundary is considered sound.</p> <p>Girton – South side of Huntingdon Road – The Green Belt boundary in this part of the district was reviewed during the preparation of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (AAP), adopted in 2009. The site was not removed from the Green Belt and the North West Cambridge AAP has been through inquiry and found sound.</p> <p>The above site, together with Land at Howes Close / Whitehouse Lane, Girton, form a very important part of the separation between Girton and the edge of Cambridge.</p> <p>Scotsdales Garden Centre - the site has been in the Green Belt since 1965, before planning permission for the garden centre was approved in 1969. Growth of site has taken place with the Green Belt designation in place and there has been no material change in circumstances to warrant its removal. The inspector examining the Local Development Framework only recently concluded that the exclusion of this site from the Green Belt is sound as most of the site is occupied by open parking areas, outside storage, and grassed / landscaped areas and most of the structures are of the glasshouse type or have one or more open sides. The scale and nature of development do not constitute such exceptional circumstances as to warrant changing the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Notcutts Garden Centre – The same principles as Scotsdales Garden Centre apply to this site (see above).</p> <p>Great Abington – The former A11/A505 junction site forms the outer boundary of the Green Belt. The boundary has been drawn</p>
--	---

	<p>along the alignment of the old A11 road, which remains a clear and defensible boundary. The Green Belt boundary is considered sound.</p> <p>Remaining sites – It is not unusual to have areas of built development within the Green Belt. Where sites contain buildings, it is low density and rural in character, not considered part of the built-up area. Many of these sites also sought a change to the village framework boundaries but having been assessed against the criteria, none of them met the criteria and no changes are proposed (see Policy S/7). The boundaries of the Green Belt are clear and long established.</p> <p>Proposals also seeking Housing Allocation at policy H/1: For main issues and assessments of village objection sites, including Green Belt issues, see Annex B.</p> <p>The sites have been assessed through the SHLAA and SA processes. The importance of land to Green Belt purposes was considered through these processes. Some of the sites were also consulted upon as Site Options in I&O 2012 or I&O2 2013. They have not been included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as there were better site options to meet the development strategy.</p> <p>Impington Lane site – see assessment for ‘Impington site’ under ‘General objections’.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Policy S/5: Provision of New Jobs and Homes

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 3	Jobs Target
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario Projections for the Cambridgeshire Local Authorities and Peterborough UA – SQW & Cambridge Econometrics • East of England Forecasting Model 2012 – Cambridgeshire County Council • Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 (January 2012) • Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 – and its supporting Technical Report
Existing policies	Core Strategy DPD: Policy ST/8
Analysis	<p>The NPPF says that planning should act, encourage and not impede sustainable economic growth and should have significant weight. Local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet development needs of business. Investment should not be over-burdened by policy expectations. Local plans must set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively encourages sustainable economic growth and provide for anticipated needs.</p> <p>The current development strategy for the Cambridge area aims to encourage the provision of new jobs to support the nationally and internationally successful local economy with its focus on the high technology and research sectors. The strategy was originally conceived in the Regional Plan for East Anglia in 2000 and confirmed and refined in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003. Both those plans have now fallen away and the current strategy for the district is provided by the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework documents adopted between 2007 and 2010.</p> <p>A key issue for the new Local Plan will be the appropriate levels of new employment and housing development that should be planned to come forward over the next 20 years.</p> <p>The Council’s vision includes the desire to ensure that “South Cambridgeshire will continue to be the best place to live and work in the country.” Also that “Our district will demonstrate impressive and sustainable economic growth”. To help achieve this, the Council wishes to include policies in the new Local Plan that support the local economy and enable new jobs to be created. It is therefore relevant to consider the increase in the total number of jobs that is anticipated to take place in the district by 2031.</p> <p>New jobs will need new employees and the aim has been to provide a greater number of new homes than previously as close to the jobs in and around Cambridge as possible, with the aim of</p>

	<p>providing a better balance between jobs and homes in and close to Cambridge, to help reduce commuting and congestion and providing a more sustainable pattern of development. That has resulted in high levels of planned growth in both employment and housing in South Cambridgeshire, and the expectation of significant in-migration to provide the new workers to support the new jobs.</p> <p>The Cambridge economy is nationally and internationally important. The Cambridge Cluster, as it has become known has developed over the last 50 years, with particularly strong growth in the later 1980s and 1990s. It provides a high technology business hub with links to a research community with a focus on science and technology research, building on the internationally important Cambridge University.</p> <p>The Cambridge economy has withstood the recession better than most parts of the country. Forecasts undertaken in 2009 for the Cambridgeshire Councils as part of the Cambridgeshire Development Study concluded that taking account of the early part of the recession and the anticipated rate of recovery, the current development strategy (which looked to 2016) would actually meet the needs of the area for much longer.</p> <p>New forecasts have been commissioned by the Joint Strategic Planning Unit on behalf of the Cambridgeshire authorities to review the impact of the recession locally. The Scenario Projections undertaken by SQW and Cambridge Econometrics use the Local Economic Forecasting Model. It is the same model as informed the Structure Plan 2003 and the work on the draft East of England Plan >2031. The model is an economic led model which is only affected by population inputs to a relatively minor extent and generally assumes that the workers will be found for the jobs identified, with any local shortfall made up by in-commuting. It predicts the number of jobs (full and part time) rather than the number of people, reflecting the fact that some people have more than one job.</p> <p>The LEFM is demand-led and models the relationships between firms, households, government and the rest of the world in a highly disaggregated framework (looking at 41 industries), which enables the impact on the economy of changing demands, such as an increase in demand due to stronger world growth, to be analysed. The disaggregated nature of the model is important because it allows the model to distinguish the very different relationships that exist between particular industries. For example, electronics is distinguished from other, more basic, manufacturing sectors that operate in completely different markets.</p>
--	---

	<p>The outputs based on the County Council's population forecasts (the Alternative Demography-based projections) have been used as the most reasonable for South Cambridgeshire's circumstances. This is instead of the baseline figures which use the ONS population figures based on past trends of population increase. The current development strategy envisages a higher rate of development than previously and therefore are the more reasonable forecasts to use. The model also uses population inputs to predict change in sectors more directly associated with population growth such as retailing, education, health and construction. Notwithstanding, there is little material difference between the outputs from both these scenarios with the baseline forecasts only 700 fewer jobs over the next 20 years.</p> <p>The work concludes that the earlier forecasts had been more pessimistic than necessary and the number of jobs has stood up in the Cambridge area better than had been anticipated. In fact, there was an overall growth in jobs approaching 4,000 between 2008 and 2011, even though there was a short term dip in total jobs in 2010. Overall, employment numbers have proved fairly resilient with employers opting for shorter hours and reduced pay rather than wholesale redundancies.</p> <p>The rate of jobs growth is still predicted to be much slower than had been predicted at the time of the last round of plan making. Over the last 20 years 1991-2011, the total number of jobs has increased from 68,400 to 81,300 amounting to an additional 31,500 jobs (46.1%). The increase averaged 1,600 additional jobs per annum over the same period, although it dropped to around 1,000 per annum during the recession 2008-2011.</p> <p>Looking at the forecasts for jobs growth over the next 20 year period 2011-2031, the model predicts that they will increase from 81,300 to 104,400 amounting to an additional 23,100 jobs, an increase of 28.4%. The increase assumes an average of 1,200 jobs per annum over the 20 years of the plan period. This is therefore lower than the rate of increase in jobs over the last 20 years. This is to be expected given the Cambridge Cluster is now maturing. South Cambridgeshire is still projected to be the fastest growing district in Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>The rate of increase predicted as the area responds to and recovers from the recession over the next 10 years is around 1,000 additional jobs per annum, so reflecting steady performance during the recession so far. The annual rate of increase is predicted to pick up during the following 10 year period to an average of 1,300 per annum leading up to 2031. The past performance in the district, the way it has withstood the worst effects of the recession suggest that</p>
--	---

	<p>the predictions are a reasonable estimate of future performance, given the inherent uncertainty at the present time.</p> <p>The model's annual average UK GDP growth rates used in the baseline are as follows:</p> <p>2001 - 2011 1.4% pa 2011 - 2021 2.6% pa 2021 - 2031 2.4% pa</p> <p>This view of the UK economy comes from a forecast produced in the LEFM UK sectoral model. The county and district projections, which are the outputs of LEFM, assume that historical relationships between a given area and the East of England or UK (depending upon which area's historical results show it has the strongest relationship with) continue into the future. As such, the baseline reflects projections for the local areas taking into account the forecast at the time for the UK and the regions. The outputs are local economic performance against this modelled national growth rate. The 2001 – 2011 average of 1.4% includes the severe recessionary effects during 2008 and 2009.</p> <p>The model also looks at what would happen locally if the national economy performed a bit better or worse than expected (i.e. that GDP were to be higher or lower than anticipated by +/- 0.5%). The low and high scenarios alter the national position (and consequently the East of England position) and measure the impacts upon the projections at the local area level.</p> <p>The low growth scenario suggests that the rate of increase in jobs could fall as low as 700 jobs per annum, or a total increase of 14,000 jobs over the plan period. This is an extremely pessimistic forecast and most likely would only become reality if there were some prolonged turmoil in international markets over a number of years. This rate of growth is lower than achieved during the recession.</p> <p>The high growth scenario suggests that the rate of increase in jobs could rise to as much as 1,500 jobs per annum or an increase of 29,200 jobs. Whilst this isn't as high as the rate achieved over the last 20 years, it would be extremely optimistic given the natural slow down in growth of the Cambridge Cluster at this stage in its development, even if there were major changes in economic policy locally. It also seems unrealistic given the current state of the economy and the broadly accepted expectations that it will take some considerable time to recover from the recession.</p> <p>Alternative new forecasts are provided by the East of England</p>
--	---

	<p>Forecasting Model (EEFM). Both models are complex and straightforward comparison is not easy. Forecasters advise that each model should be regarded as ‘a view’ on the local economy, neither ‘right’ and both offer perspectives and insights that ought to be considered in light of local knowledge.</p> <p>The key differences in the EEFM forecasts are that they predict overall that growth in the county will be lower than the LEFM, 82,100 jobs compared with 96,200, but that growth in South Cambridgeshire will be slightly higher than LEFM predicts, 24,800 jobs compared with 23,100. The EEFM forecasts for South Cambridgeshire are baseline: 24,800 jobs, lost decade: 16,800 jobs, and high growth: 31,300 jobs. The rate of growth over the next 20 years also varies. EEFM predicts a faster recovery (1.7%) and then a slower rate of growth (0.9%), whilst LEFM predicts a slower recovery (1.2%) and faster rate of growth later in the plan period (1.3%). Both models see South Cambridgeshire as the fastest growing district.</p> <p>In the past, there have been particular concerns expressed by the Cambridgeshire local authorities with regard to the modelled outputs from EEFM. The latest model run is not greatly different from the LEFM over the 20 year period, although the predictions for the speed at which the economy will recover seem particularly optimistic in the EEFM even given the performance over the downturn. It is positive that models predict strong future growth for South Cambridgeshire. The Council has previously concluded that the LEFM model is the most robust for the local area and, on balance, continues to take that view.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The LEFM predicted jobs increases for the low growth scenario, the Alternative Demography scenario, and the high growth scenarios, are considered to provide the most reasonable options for low, medium and high target options for additional jobs.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 3: How much new employment do you consider the Local Plan should provide for?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Lower jobs growth – 14,000 additional jobs over the Plan period (700 jobs per year) ii) Medium jobs growth - 23,100 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,200 jobs per year) iii) High jobs growth - 29,200 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,500 jobs per year)

<p>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</p>	<p>Options concern the overall level of jobs growth that should be planned for in the district. Site specific impacts would depend on location and design of development, addressed by other options, it is therefore difficult to assess the impact on a number of objectives as a result of these options. Clearly planning for large scale jobs growth has absolute implications in terms of resource use such as land, water and waste creation. Planning for a smaller rate of growth could use less land, but all options effectively still plan for a large level of jobs growth. The Water Cycle Strategy identifies that growth would result in a significant increase in water use, although the scale of the impact will be determined by options regarding water efficiency.</p> <p>In terms implications of for the land objectives, the need to use greenfield land will again depend on Site Specific issues, but given the limited stock of previously developed land, higher options are likely to have a greater impact. Higher levels of development could also put greater pressure on transport infrastructure, and create higher numbers of journeys by car, but again this would to a great extent depend on where jobs are developed, and the relationship with housing growth.</p> <p>Key impacts relate to economic objectives. Impacts depend to a significant extent on the wider economy, therefore there is some uncertainty, which has been reflected in the need to apply a number of economic growth scenarios. The 'low' option (i) would plan for a lower number of jobs than is actually predicted, taking a pessimistic view of the economy. This could hold back growth of the local economy by not providing enough land to meet demand, and potentially inhibit further development of the high technology clusters if this proved to be overly pessimistic. If it were combined with higher housing growth levels it could result in increased levels of unemployment, or higher levels of commuting to access jobs elsewhere.</p> <p>Forecasting suggests the medium jobs growth scenario (ii) is the most likely. Planning to accommodate this level of jobs will benefit the local economy, and support access to jobs. If the economy were to develop faster it could hold back economic growth.</p> <p>A higher jobs growth scenario (iii) would plan for higher levels of economic growth, and therefore provide even greater support to the local economy and availability of local jobs. Again the impact must be considered in combination with housing growth options, and planning for a higher number of jobs than is realistic could result in a higher housing target than needed given the amount of in-migration that would take place to support the creation of new jobs, again resulting in potentially higher unemployment levels or out</p>
--	---

	<p>commuting to jobs elsewhere. Conversely, a higher jobs target combined with a lower housing target could mean more commuting into the district. It could also result in over provision of employment land if the jobs are not actually created.</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>i. Support: 61; Object: 7; Comment: 9</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 1: (where a specific preference was expressed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only for local needs:45 • As few as possible:12 • Less than 700 jobs: 17 • 700 jobs: 73 • 700 to 1000 jobs: 305 <p>ii. Support: 33; Object: 14; Comment: 8</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 1: (where a specific preference was expressed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1000 jobs: 31 • 1000 to 1200 jobs: 13 • 1200 jobs: 33 <p>iii. Support: 21; Object: 11; Comment: 2</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 1: (where a specific preference was expressed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1200 to 1500 jobs: 2 • 1500 jobs: 10 • 1600 jobs:5 • As many as possible:18 <p>Please provide any comments: Support: 2; Object: 13; Comment: 40 with 658 total comments from Questionnaire responses (including those mentioned above).</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>i. Lower Jobs Growth</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This target is more realistic in light of the absence of any major new employment sites in the district, the current economic climate, the evidence in the Cambridge Cluster at 50 Report, the fact that many of the existing hi-tech sites are now mature, and current infrastructure. • Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - more realistic, achievable and likely to match the number of houses built. Job numbers can increase if there is demand. • Easier to revise targets upwards if necessary, however the Council must encourage new businesses (including small businesses) and occasionally it doesn't. If the Council's

	<p>assumptions are too optimistic, will simply provide for long distance commuters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If jobs growth actually exceeds this rate, then additional housing can be brought forward – plan, monitor, manage. • The Local Plan should accommodate responsiveness to change not dictate what will happen. • Economic growth is important but it must be sustainable – current infrastructure is not able to cope as it is. • Would have less impact on the rural areas and leave more green spaces for people to enjoy. • Accepted the lowest target under duress, probably already too much. Great economic growth comes from quality not volume. • Balance needs to be struck between enlarging the economy and keeping the district as a good place to live. The economic success of the region is important to the well-being of the people who live there, but rapid and excessive economic growth is not. • Economic growth does not necessarily benefit all as has been shown by recent research. • There is more chance of matching housing supply to jobs with a more modest target. • Lower growth in jobs is supported as this would have the least impact on demand for new homes. • Lower jobs growth is supported provided that does not result in loss of Green Belt, makes maximum use of brownfield sites, does not compromise the rural character, and there is sufficient road access and infrastructure. • Appears over optimistic to assume the scale of growth in future will be as great as in the past – at best only likely to see modest growth balanced by reductions elsewhere. • There should be minimal local jobs, if any. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The target should be as high as possible to ensure there are no constraints to economic growth. • Disagree that more jobs and more people are going to boost the economy. There comes a point when the social fabric of society is jeopardised by over-crowding and disaffection. • Even if job growth is at this lowest level, the national population would need to grow to an unsupportable level. • Do not believe the figures or accept the basis on which they have been derived. <p>ii. Medium Jobs Growth</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears to most realistic at the present time, but the Local Plan must allow flexibility for this target to be revised in response to changing economic circumstances.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides more employment opportunities but also gives the district time to consolidate after a period of rapid growth and the infrastructure to catch up with development. • Should be regarded as an absolute maximum – the district needs to absorb existing growth and this will take time. • Cambridgeshire County Council believe this is still optimistic when compared with the EEFM ‘lost decade’ forecast. However, this option enables the local authorities to be positive about growth and job prospects, given the uncertainty and little growth over the last few years. • Good steady objective to maintain sustainable growth. • Good to have jobs, but the employees need not live in the district. • Continued growth at the higher rate is not sustainable. It is unrealistic to expect jobs to continue to increase at a higher rate as there will be job losses that will cancel out increases in others. • This seems a prudent estimate given the difficulty of making predictions. • The lower option is preferable, but actual job creation has exceeded this despite the economic downturn, so it seems sensible to plan for a higher figure. • Considered to be an ambitious but realistic target in the current climate. • Too much job growth could spoil the amenity of this area and in the next 20 years it is reasonable to assume at least one recession, so the medium target is a reasonable assumption. • Most likely scenario given the global economic climate and initiatives to provide enterprise zones elsewhere e.g. Alconbury. • Supported by Duxford and Shepreth Parish Councils. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The target for growth should be as high as possible to ensure that there are no constraints to economic growth. • Unless there is very significant investment in transport and basic infrastructure the region cannot support this level of development. • To really go for economic growth, only the high growth option is viable. The Council is required to build a substantial number of homes and the residents of these homes will need jobs, otherwise commuting will spiral out of control, causing more strain on already overloaded roads and infrastructure. <p>iii. High Jobs Growth</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General principle is that jobs growth is linked to housing growth, therefore a higher jobs target would require more housing to be delivered. Support the principle of a higher jobs target, but wish
--	---

	<p>to see a more detailed demographic and economic assessment undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Cambridge – the higher growth option may be most appropriate if the Council’s policy for selective management of the economy is amended to allow high value manufacturing and hi-tech office headquarters. • Cambridgeshire County Council (represented by Carter Jonas) – support medium to high jobs growth commensurate with the quantum of housing and suggest should embrace Cambridge’s reputation by seeking maximum level of jobs growth. • The target for jobs should be as high as possible to ensure there are no constraints to economic growth. • The high jobs growth strategy is necessary to continue, sustain and drive forward South Cambridgeshire’s pre-eminent role in the regional economy. • This would support the Council’s vision to demonstrate impressive and sustainable economic growth and would maintain the role of Cambridge as a world leader. • Essential that planning for new jobs is aspirational in order to meet the objectives of economic policy – 29,200 jobs is the minimum level required to support the economic needs of the Cambridge sub-region given its strategic importance to the economy. • This represents a reduction compared to the past 20 years but sets an optimistic target for the next 20 years. • Hertfordshire County Council – given the City’s strong economic drivers, huge housing demand and affordability issues, it seems inevitable that the high growth options for housing and jobs are likely to be necessary [LATE REP]. • Cambridge is precisely the type of location that the Government is looking to lead the UK out of the recession and therefore a high growth strategy is necessary. An NPPF compliant strategy would entail at least 1,500 jobs per year. • If the NPPF is to be followed then a high growth target should be adopted to ensure the district continues to build a strong, responsive and competitive economy. • Lower and medium growth options are inadequate. The higher growth target is the only legitimate option, but it needs to be reviewed against up to date information e.g. 2011 Census. • High jobs growth necessary to ensure economic viability of the area – must be supported by sufficient housing and education facilities, and not solely concentrated on hi-tech and research jobs. • Far better to over provide than risk under provision – it is almost certain that growth will pick up. • Highest level of job growth would provide headroom and allow the opportunity for the ‘impressive’ economic growth vision and contribute to the economic vitality of the country and county.
--	---

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little evidence to support this target. • Too much and impossible to support – would destroy South Cambridgeshire. • Unless there is significant investment in transport and other infrastructure the region cannot support this level of development. • The high growth strategy does not aim high enough. <p>Please provide any comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We want the maximum number of jobs that are sustainable. • As the economy recovers from the financial crisis, we should expect and plan for the Cambridge Cluster to grow as before. • Planning for too few jobs is potentially dangerous and unproductive, therefore the Local Plan should provide for high jobs growth. However the high jobs growth option could be higher. • Need to plan for higher level of economic growth resulting in 30,000 new jobs by 2031. • North Hertfordshire District Council – growth of the Cambridge economy is supported as it is likely to have a positive impact on the North Hertfordshire economy as well. • Given the current economic situation, it is unlikely that growth will reach pre-recession trends (5, including Linton Parish Council & Trumpington Residents Association) • Linton Parish Council - A growth rate of 1,000 seems appropriate. • Plans should be based around a more modest and prudent figure of 700 new jobs. • The vision could be compromised by too many more jobs, people and homes. • Trumpington Residents Association – the level of growth should be between the lower and medium growth projections • The Council should consider a very low / no growth scenario. • Comberton Parish Council – the Council should plan for between 700 and 1000 new jobs and the plan should be revised in 5 years if there is a stronger economic upturn. • The Local Plan should allow time for the district to absorb both the new population and associated impacts on infrastructure. If new development is to be restrained then so must delivery of jobs. Also likely that the Enterprise Zone at Alconbury will leach employment from the Cambridge Sub-Region. • Gamlingay Environmental Action Group – does not support any of the options; even the low growth option would have severe adverse impacts on the local environment. Instead, should aim for a ‘steady state’ no growth economy protecting the local environment and communities.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The depth of the recession and severity of budget cuts may require a new approach including support for local and rural entrepreneurial activity, rather than focusing on higher education, research and knowledge based industries. • Madingley Parish Council – questions the basis of the calculation on which all the long term projections are based. These numbers are far too high and not supported by factual justification. • Great and Little Chishill Parish Council – Somewhere in the middle. • As the economy of South Cambridgeshire and the city of Cambridge will remain relatively buoyant there is no need to encourage the growth of local employment. • Any new development should be supported by affordable business premises. • Ensure that strategies for housing, employment, community facilities, infrastructure and other uses are integrated. • Past growth in Cambridge has swamped the road infrastructure – new businesses will be reluctant to set up where their prospective employees will sit in gridlock. • Countryside Restoration Trust – the jobs predicted are likely to be filled by migrant workers rather than residents and the unemployed of South Cambridgeshire. • Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) – is using the EEFM forecasts as its primary source of jobs and housing numbers (unlike SCDC), as this model is capable of taking account of anticipated effects from the redevelopment of Alconbury Airfield as an Enterprise Zone. This development could have a significant impact on employment prospects in all local authority districts in Peterborough and Cambridgeshire. <p>Other Comments from Questionnaires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A joint approach between South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridge City Council, and other nearby local authorities is necessary in identifying employment and housing needs and the strategies responding to them. (4, including Cambridge City Council and Suffolk County Council). • Given the uncertainty, the Council shouldn't set jobs targets, but should respond to accommodate actual growth (3, including Cambridge Past, Present and Future & Histon & Impington Parish Council). • Housing and jobs provision should be balanced, with effective transport links between the two (5, including Cambridge City Council Labour Group and St Edmundsbury Borough Council). • Only the number which current/ planned infrastructure can cope with, in sustainable locations, within environmental capacities (34). • Create jobs elsewhere in less prosperous areas with high
--	---

	<p>unemployment (25).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan flexibly and review/ according to market trends (17). • Not all new jobs will require new homes – question the link between new jobs and need for new homes in the district (12). • Jobs needed throughout the district including rural areas (6). • Focus on high tech and research (6). • Varied job options are required to prevent the region becoming a commuter belt (2). • Create a range of jobs including manufacturing and industry (5). • More information is needed on the jobs created in the past and jobs which will be created (5). • Council cannot quantify jobs in this way if Cambridge is open for business. • Many jobs created will be part time. • Already many empty business premises. • Need small business units. • Jobs should be near to homes. • Continued growth is unsustainable.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>The NPPF says that plans should make every effort to objectively identify and then meet business needs, taking account of market signals.</p> <p>Additional evidence has been published since both the Issues and Option 1 and 2 Consultations have been carried out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 (SHMA) - published in April 2013. • The Memorandum of Co-operation published in May 2013 <p>These documents have been used by the Council to inform both the jobs and housing figures within the Local Plan.</p> <p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The Cambridge Sub Region SHMA identifies the objectively assessed needs for both housing and jobs across the area by 2031 (and extending to 2036 for Huntingdonshire to meet its proposed local plan end date). Integral to this is a separate Technical Report, which provides an overview of the national, sub-national and local data drawn upon to inform the levels of housing of jobs need set out in the SHMA.</p> <p>The Technical Report accompanying the updated SHMA contains information about future forecasts for jobs that will be needed by all the districts for their local plans including South Cambridgeshire. It identifies the objectively assessed need for additional jobs in South Cambridgeshire taking account of the findings of two different local economic forecasting models – the East of England</p>

	<p>Forecasting Model (EEFM) and the Local Economic Forecasting Model (LEFM). Both models are characterised by a professional assessment of the economic climate at the time of the baseline forecasts. Local economic growth determines employment growth, and both models forecast local economic growth based on observed past trends. Alongside these economic models the SHMA used a range of available national and local demographic forecasts, having regard to the proportion of economic growth expected to be created in South Cambridgeshire to forecast the jobs figure for the district. The latest SHMA was published in April 2013 and therefore has provided an up-to-date forecast taking into account data from the 2011 Census. The Council considers that this provides a technically robust forecast for the district.</p> <p>The Localism Act 2011 places a Duty to Co-operate on local planning authorities. This requires them to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of development plan documents where this involves strategic matters and to be able to demonstrate having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts. The preparation of the new chapters in the SHMA demonstrates how the councils within the Cambridge Housing Market Area have carried out this duty.</p> <p>This collaborative working has been formally acknowledged by all the districts within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation which has been recently produced. The purpose of this memorandum is to formally record and make public the local authorities' agreement under the Duty to Cooperate to the position as set out in the Memorandum, subject to ratification by their full Council as part of their individual Local Plan preparation. The Memorandum of Cooperation confirms that South Cambridgeshire District Council will plan in full for its objectively assessed needs in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The number of jobs to be included in the Local Plan is 22,000 additional jobs which is the figure identified as the objectively assessed needs of the district identified in the SHMA. This is consistent with the requirement of the NPPF. The figure is close to the Medium option consulted on in 2012. The Council considers this will support the Cambridge Cluster and provide for the creation of a diverse range of local jobs within the plan period. The number of jobs is a forecast and not a target to be met at all costs. The Council considers it important to plan for the full objectively assessed needs of the district and supports the objective of maintaining a strong and dynamic local economy into the future. The lower target option has therefore been rejected given the potential of restricting local growth. The higher target option is also rejected as the policy for the plan as forecasts suggest that level of</p>
--	--

	<p>growth is not realistically likely to take place although the plan provides flexibility as set out below.</p> <p>The predicted level of jobs growth is provided for in full in the Local Plan as a key part of the continued support for the Council's vision to demonstrate impressive and sustainable economic growth. This will help maintain the role of the Cambridge area as a world leader in higher education, research and knowledge based industries and the important role of South Cambridgeshire, including a number of major research parks at Cambridge Science Park, Hinxton Hall and Granta Park.</p> <p>A set of flexible policies have been included in the Economy chapter of the local plan to assist in delivering a wide range of local jobs to ensure that the local economy continues to be strong and grows into the future. Sufficient land has been identified in the plan to provide for the predicted 22,000 additional jobs with sufficient surplus if the economy performs better than expected. The phasing delivery and monitoring policy requires the monitoring of forecast and actual delivery of jobs and to respond if it appears that policies and allocations are not being achieved or more up to date forecasts suggest that the objectively assessed needs of South Cambridgeshire require different levels of development and identifies a number of mechanisms that could be used in response.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	<p>Policy S/5: Provision of New Jobs and Homes</p> <p>Policy S/12: Phasing, Delivery and Monitoring</p>

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 4	Housing Provision
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 2010 - 2011 • East of England Forecasting Model 2012 – Cambridgeshire County Council • Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012 • Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 – and its supporting Technical Report
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD: ST/3 Re-Using Previously Developed Land and Buildings • Development Control Policies DPD: DP/1 Sustainable Development
Analysis	<p>The NPPF says that plans should make every effort to objectively identify and then meet housing needs, taking account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.</p>

	<p>It clarifies that to boost the supply of housing, Local Plans should meet the full, objectively assessed needs of market and affordable housing in the housing market area, including identifying key sites that are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.</p> <p>A key issue for the new Local Plan will be the appropriate level of new housing development that should be planned to come forward over the next 20 years.</p> <p>The current LDF and the Cambridge Local Plan propose sufficient housing for the needs of the current population and to support the anticipated increase in jobs which is likely to result in people moving into the Cambridge area. For the new Local Plans to only provide for new jobs would perpetuate the imbalance between homes and jobs in and close to Cambridge and the congestion and emissions that arise from traffic travelling to those jobs.</p> <p>Recent plans for South Cambridgeshire have included relatively high levels of growth, reflecting the success of the Cambridge Cluster and the aim to provide more housing close to jobs in and close to Cambridge. The housing target in the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy, reflecting that in the Structure Plan 2003, is 20,000 new homes between 1999 and 2016. This required an average of 1,176 dwellings per year to be delivered. This was reflected in the annual rate to 2021 in the East of England Plan 2008 of 1,175 dwellings per year, but was more than the draft East of England Plan >2031 rate of 1,050 dwellings per year, which was based on more recent forecasting and taking account of the beginning of the downturn.</p> <p>Looking back over housing completions over the last 20 years since 1999, the average annual rate achieved was 694 dwellings. However, it is not appropriate to directly compare past delivery rates with proposed rates as the development strategy was very different at that time. The 2004 Local Plan covered the period 1991 to 2006 and proposed an annual rate of housing delivery of 753 dwellings per year (11,300 over the 15 year period), so delivery was relatively close to the planned housing levels. The current plan therefore proposed a step change in the rate of housebuilding. Within the past 20 year period there has been a lot of fluctuation in the annual number of completions, reflecting a number of economic cycles and changing development strategies. However, it is of note that with the current development strategy being adopted in 2007, completions reached their highest levels in 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 of 924 and 1,274 dwellings respectively, just before the recession hit. This was also before the new major sites had come forward and more consistently higher completion rates can be expected once they are delivering housing on site. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that</p>
--	---

	<p>higher rates of development could be completed than over the last 20 years with appropriate allocations and market conditions over the period as a whole.</p> <p>Forecasts for natural population growth over the plan period would require an additional 8,400 dwellings to be built (420 per annum). However, this would not provide for even the lowest level of jobs growth predicted and would therefore not support the economy and could either stifle economic growth or lead to increased commuting through the district with adverse impacts on sustainable growth.</p> <p>The Council's preferred forecasting model (Cambridge Econometrics Local Economic Forecasting Model) does not provide forecasts for new housing to go with the forecast new jobs. Population is an input to the model, which has an impact on the population related jobs such as in retail and education, but has limited implications for wider jobs forecasts. However, the alternative forecasting model that has also recently been produced is the East of England Forecasting Model (EEFM) and that does include forecasts of the dwelling numbers needed to support the forecast jobs.</p> <p>The 'baseline' EEFM forecasts predict that 21,400 new dwellings would be required to support the predicted baseline jobs, which are slightly higher than the medium target in the jobs target options. However, as the dwellings number included in the East of England Plan was informed by the earlier Cambridgeshire Development Study forecasts which were lower than now predicted, it is considered reasonable to take that dwellings number, rounded to the nearest 500, giving 21,500 dwellings as a medium housing growth option.</p> <p>If higher levels of jobs growth were to take place in South Cambridgeshire, there would need to be commensurate higher levels of housing growth if the imbalance between jobs and homes were not to be exacerbated. The EEFM concludes that 23,700 dwellings would be required to support the high jobs scenario, which rounded gives 23,500 dwellings as a high housing growth option.</p> <p>The EEFM forecast for dwelling numbers to support the low jobs forecast is very similar to the baseline. The consultants explain this as being because whilst in-migration nationally has fallen with the recession, it is expected to rise again. The change in population under this scenario is much less severe compared with the jobs change, and recent economic conditions do not appear to have had as strong an impact on migration levels as they would have expected. They say a similar impact on migration is observed in the East region in this scenario. Since population is only lower by 19,000 people by 2031, the spread across 48 local authorities means that overall impact at a local authority level by 2031 will be relatively</p>
--	--

	<p>low compared to jobs impacts.</p> <p>Whilst this may make sense in terms of modelling, the Council questions whether those assumptions are reasonable for South Cambridgeshire, where a relatively high proportion of the demand for new housing is for people moving to the district to take up the jobs created. If the jobs are not created there is not the local need to provide additional housing beyond the high levels already needed to support the planned and any forecast new jobs. The Council therefore rejects the EEFM dwelling figure as an appropriate option for consultation.</p> <p>The Council considers that the best available information to draw on for a housing figure to support the low growth jobs figure, is to use the ONS population forecasts which are trend based. It is considered reasonable that the past rate of growth will continue, simply having regard to the current development strategy and existing supply of housing land, even if the rate of jobs increase were to drop significantly. This would continue to help support the Cambridge Cluster and the balance between jobs and homes close to Cambridge. The ONS population forecasts therefore represent a low option for housing growth. Converting the ONS population forecasts into housing requirements has been done by the County Council Research Group using its local model that takes account of the characteristics of the local population and household formation rates. That results in a low growth housing option for new housing of approximately 18,500 or an average of 925 dwellings per annum. This is higher than the average over the previous 20 years but that average does not take account of the higher levels of growth now planned for in current plans, including land on the edge of Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe.</p> <p>In setting the overall housing target, it is relevant to consider the high level of need in the district that exists for affordable housing and is predicted to be required over the plan period. As set out in Chapter 9: Delivering High Quality Homes, there is a need for 15,049 affordable housing over the plan period. Housing developments are the key source of providing new affordable housing, with other sources such as exceptions sites and other schemes by social housing providers being more limited in terms of absolute numbers of new affordable homes, although their local benefits are important. Using the current requirement for 40% of new housing to be affordable, none of the target options for new housing would fully meet the anticipated locally arising needs over the plan period.</p> <p>The options for housing growth need to be considered in the context of the current development strategy and the amount of housing that already has planning permission or is allocated for housing</p>
--	--

development in current plans. The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) 2010-2011 includes a housing trajectory that shows that at the end of March 2011 there were 2,897 dwellings with planning permission. It also showed 12,926 dwellings allocated for development in current plans that were predicted to have been built by 2031, giving a total supply of 15,823. It is important to be as realistic as possible about the delivery of housing from current proposals so that sufficient housing land is allocated to meet housing needs. Within this context, it is considered reasonable to continue to rely on the majority of the current allocations to have been completed by 2031. However, the AMR figure has been revised to 11,300 dwellings to reflect changes in circumstances in relation to 2 major sites:

- Northstowe – A delay in the start of completions in the first phase of development at Northstowe compared with the AMR housing trajectory but reflecting that the outline planning application has now been received and is due to be determined by the end of 2012. This has the effect of reducing the amount of the new town that is anticipated to be built by 2031 to approximately 7,500 dwellings with the remaining 2,000 dwellings coming after that date. This is the only development in current plans that is expected to continue providing housing after 2031.
- Cambridge East - The revised figure excludes land North of Newmarket Road given current uncertainty about the delivery of that site, which will be explored through the plan making process. No allowance has been made for any development at Cambridge Airport. Cambridge East is covered in detail in Chapter 13: Site Specific Issues.

Taking permissions and latest predicted delivery from allocations together gives a total housing supply of 14,200 that will go towards each of the housing targets.

The housing trajectory will be reviewed in detail with developers and landowners before the draft plan is prepared as part of the preparation of the next Annual Monitoring Report and will take account of any other changes in circumstance, in particular the effects on development timetables of the expected Government announcement over the summer in relation to improvements to the A14.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

It is considered that there are 3 reasonable alternative options for housing growth: low, medium and high. These relate to the corresponding amount of new jobs forecast in the low, medium and high jobs growth options. The options are:

- Low housing growth option: 18,500 dwellings (925 dwellings per year) – existing growth plus sites for 4,300 dwellings
- Medium housing growth option: 21,500 dwellings (1,075

	<p> dwellings per year) – existing growth plus sites for 7,300 dwellings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High housing growth option: 23,500 dwellings (1,175 dwellings per year) – existing growth plus sites for 9,300 dwellings
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 4:</p> <p>A. How much new housing do you consider the Local Plan should provide for?</p> <p>i) Lower housing growth - additional 4,300 dwellings (equal to 925 dwellings per year)</p> <p>ii) Medium housing growth - additional 6,800 dwellings (equates to 1,050 dwellings per year)</p> <p>iii) High housing growth - additional 9,300 dwellings (equate to 1,175 dwellings per year)</p> <p>B. Do you agree with the assumption for delivery of housing at Northstowe of approximately 500 homes per year?</p> <p>(Issues and Options 2 Part 1 Chapter 5 also addressed targets)</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Options concern the overall level of housing growth that should be planned for in the district. Similar to the jobs growth options, site specific impacts would depend on location and design of development, addressed by other options, it is therefore difficult to assess the impact on a number of objectives as a result of these options.</p> <p>Clearly planning for large scale housing growth has absolute implications in terms of resource use such as land, water and waste creation, with larger options requiring more resources. The Water Cycle Strategy identifies that growth would result in a significant increase in water use, although the scale of the impact will be determined by options regarding water efficiency. A limited supply of previously developed land in the district also means higher options could have a higher impact on the land objectives, although this would depend on the package of sites selected.</p> <p>Impact of housing growth options is also closely linked with the employment growth options, so to a significant extent the impact of the housing option depends on which employment option is taken.</p> <p>The lowest growth option (i) would make the least contribution to addressing housing needs, particularly the high level of local need for affordable housing. However, if the lowest option for jobs is taken, it</p>

	<p>would reflect the needs of the area. If jobs growth is higher, it could also hinder the local economy, holding back the supply of local labour and result in higher levels of commuting.. It could make limited contribution to the objective of providing a better balance between jobs and home close to Cambridge.</p> <p>The medium growth option (ii) would reflect the anticipated jobs growth, although it still would not address fully the specific needs for affordable housing.</p> <p>The high option (iii) would make an even greater contribution to the delivery of affordable housing, but could mean more out commuting if the high jobs target were not delivered and therefore the numbers of new homes were not balanced with new jobs. Higher options would place additional pressure on transport and social infrastructure, but they would also provide resources to enable further investment.</p> <p>In terms of transport infrastructure, and achieving sustainable transport, more homes could simply be more people on the networks and using cars. However, the relationship is not that straight forward, as delivery of homes in the right places, enabling more people to live close to jobs and services, could actually reduce the need to travel, and support use of sustainable modes. This would clearly depend on how growth is implemented, determined by other options.</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>Question 4A i. Support:77; Object: 30; Comment: 11</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 2: (where a specific preference was expressed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option i: 87 + Comberton Parish Council (Supported by 301 signatories, of which 267 signatories have been individually registered) • Lower target or the minimum Needed: 70 <p>ii. Support: 35; Object: 34; Comment: 4</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 2: (where a specific preference was expressed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option ii: 47 <p>iii. Support:59; Object: 21; Comment: 4</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 2: (where a specific preference was expressed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option iii: 19 • Higher target: 4 <p>Please provide any additional comments:</p>

	<p>Comment: 57 (Total of 687 comments from Questionnaire responses including those referenced above)</p> <p>Question 4B Support:8; Object: 29; Comment:10</p> <p>Issues and Options 2 Part 1 Chapter 5 Support:8; Object: 17; Comment:7</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>i. Lower Housing Growth</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect the character of the area, protect villages, limit development of greenfield land, minimise impact on the environment; and protect quality of life. • Infrastructure already over-stretched. • Would meet local needs. Much of housing growth is being used for London commuting. • Need for a joint approach with Cambridge City Council. • More work needed to confirm there is actually housing need. • Already a good range and mix of houses available, many existing houses are difficult to sell. • This is still a high target. • Lower figure reflects changes in the economy. • CPRE- Support lower figure in line with lower jobs figure. • Barton, Coton and Madingley Parish Councils - Economic modelling has an optimistic bias, not based on the current situation. • Grantchester Parish Council - The boundary between the City and South Cambridgeshire must be maintained. • Bourn, Caldecote, Caxton, Comberton, Croydon, Fen Ditton, Fowlmere, Foxton, Great Shelford, Hatley, Milton, Shepreth, Waterbeach and Whaddon Parish Councils – Support. • Comberton Parish Council (Supported by 301 signatories, of which 267 signatories have been individually registered) - It would be prudent to plan for fewer additional houses - around 4,300 - and use the acknowledged delay in the economic recovery to develop mostly on truly brown field sites, avoid rush to develop on agricultural land. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be a lower figure. The area is already being used to commute to London. • Development at any level is unsustainable. • Need to protect villages and quality of life. • New jobs and homes should go to other areas of the UK. • Why more development when there is so much already planned? • Planning should be based on the individual merits of proposals rather than a target.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will not meet local needs. • Would not be sound to include a target which did not reflect objectively assessed needs. • Council has not taken positive action to resolve shortage of affordable housing. • There are significant consequences associated with an under supply of housing, such as not meeting the local housing and affordable housing need and increased in-commuting and associated traffic congestion. • Should be as high as possible to keep pace with high economic growth. • Fears over impacts of higher growth targets are unfounded. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic growth in next 10-20 years unlikely to be on scale seen previously. • Fewer start-ups in high tech sector will mean slower growth in 5-10 years time. • If windfalls deliver 200 a year, could meet lower target. • Council should focus on preserving the rural character of the area rather than turning it into an endless suburb. If a housing target higher than zero must be set, however, it should be as low as possible. • Even low growth will place strain on Character of the City and its surroundings; • Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council – Lower growth targets are more realistic, otherwise district will be catering for long distance commuters. • Hauxton Parish Council - Do not build large numbers of houses in the hope that the jobs will be created. <p>ii. Medium Housing Growth</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balance between catering for growth and avoiding adverse impacts. • Appears the most realistic at the present time, but need to be flexible in response to changing economic circumstances. • Will enable organic growth of settlements. • Will deliver housing towards meeting local needs. • Balanced with economic forecasts. • Need to consider infrastructure e.g. public transport. Lack of infrastructure means area could not support higher growth. • SCDC should make clear it will not accept speculative development. • Babraham, Cambourne, Duxford, Gamlingay, Great Abington, Ickleton, Litlington, Little Abington, Over, Rampton, Steeple Morden and Weston Colville Parish Councils - Support.
--	--

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much growth, would not reflect council's vision. • Overoptimistic. • Would require development of greenfield land, negative impact on green belt, local character, historic environment, infrastructure, and quality of life. • Planning should be based on the individual merits of proposals rather than a target. • Fen Ditton Parish Council – Object. • The high target represents a continuation of the current target, SCDC has not explored a higher growth option which would meet identified affordable housing needs. • Would not be sound to include a target which did not reflect objectively assessed needs. • Council has not taken positive action to resolve shortage of affordable housing. • There are significant consequences associated with an under supply of housing, such as not meeting the local housing and affordable housing need and increased in-commuting and associated traffic congestion. • Under supply of 4827 against previous target to 2016. A reduced target would not cover shortfall. • Should be as high as possible to keep pace with high economic growth. • Fears over impacts of higher growth targets are unfounded. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to carefully consider types of housing needs e.g size of dwellings. • Cottenham Parish Council – Medium growth, but subject to regular review to respond to forecast changes in demand. <p>iii. High Housing Growth</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prosperous area with thriving economy and demand for housing remains high. • Represents a continuation of the current strategy. • Plan for highest number of homes, linked to highest job growth scenario. • Take account of increasing new household formations arising from current trends such as the growth in single person households and in-migration. • Reduce burden of commuting. • High growth option most likely to meet needs. • Lower targets would fall short of household growth forecasts of the east of England Forecasting Model. • Higher rate is achievable, 1,274 homes were built in 2007-2008.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to account for previous under supply in the district, as shown in Annual Monitoring Report. • Need to over allocate to ensure delivery, and to respond to changing circumstances. • Should be as high as possible to keep pace with high economic growth. • Help reduce long-term housing costs, address balance between housing and jobs. • London commuting cannot be controlled, need to account for it in housing needs. • Development can make greatest contribution to affordable housing delivery. • Target should be increased to enable greater delivery of affordable housing, and meet affordable housing needs. • The high target represents a continuation of the current target, SCDC has not explored a higher growth option which would meet identified affordable housing needs. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much growth, would not reflect council's vision. • Damage to local environment, historic character. • Lack of infrastructure and amenities. • Based on immigration of workers rather than local needs; • Planning should be based on the individual merits of proposals rather than a target. • Fen Ditton Parish Council – Object. • No option put forward that would fully meet anticipated needs. • Too low to meet aspirations for employment within the district. • Fears over impacts of higher growth targets are unfounded. • Key objectives of the Framework, set out in para. 47 is to “<i>Boost significantly the supply of housing</i>”. • 'High' housing growth target has been set at a level which is wholly insufficient to meet even the affordable housing requirement over the next 5 years. • There are significant consequences associated with an under supply of housing, such as not meeting the local housing and affordable housing need and increased in-commuting and associated traffic congestion. • Take account of unmet need at beginning of plan period. • Projections rely on 2001 census data, giving a degree of inaccuracy. • Concern that the SHMA 2009 is out of date. • Need to ensure jobs growth is not stifled, adopt an aspirational target which will provide the greatest prospect of the local economy fulfilling its significant potential as a globally significant high-tech cluster. • Ned to respond to significant under supply against past targets, Council has failed to respond to residual needs. Ignoring past
--	---

	<p>shortfalls will progressively depress the housing requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider 'hidden homeless'. • SHMA should factor in the need for the additional households that would be required to offset the loss of working age population. • Taking the employment-led housing requirement together with the historic shortfall in housing delivery between 2001 and 2011, the Council should be seeking to provide a minimum of 27,200 additional dwellings (1,360 per annum). A further option (Option 4 of 27,200 dwellings) should be considered. • The <i>minimum</i> housing target necessary in South Cambridgeshire should be set at 1,565 dwellings per year for the District (representing a total of 31,300 over the Plan Period). • Must also take account of development constraints in Cambridge City. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hertfordshire County Council - Given city's strong economic drivers, huge housing demand and affordability issues, it seems inevitable that of the options for housing and employment growth, those at upper end are likely to be necessary. <p>Please provide any comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council (and 2 others) - Need for joined up planning with Cambridge City Council and the wider area • North Hertfordshire District Council – an NPPF-compliant Cambridge sub-regional SHMA may be necessary to support the housing targets, which should also be associated with the district's economic growth strategy; • St Edmundsbury Borough Council – Need balance between homes and jobs; • Environment Agency - imperative that any increase in the number of homes is appropriately assessed, particularly in relation to water infrastructure and notably the potential impacts on water quality as a result of increased foul water flows to Waste Water Treatment Works; • Natural England - Whilst acknowledging the need for the level of development to meet demand, options which have least impact on the natural environment would be preferred; • Great and Little Chishill Parish Council – somewhere between higher and lower figure; • Linton Parish Council - It is restrictive and risky to plan solely on basis of a direct correlation between new jobs and new homes. Technology means more people likely to work from home. • Madingley Parish Council (& 1 other) – targets have been set too high, based on over optimistic long term projections; • Further information is required on housing and economic needs
--	---

	<p>for South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A level of housing delivery across both authority areas below the 1,750 'Option 1' • All viable locations will be developed in due course since little prospect that expansion will cease; all that is uncertain is its rate; • Oppose plans to build 12,500 homes in the Green Belt; • Plan for a growth rate that is achievable; • It is not the correct role of government to centrally plan the level of housing; • Make better use of brownfield sites; re-use existing buildings; use empty homes first • Plans should reflect anticipated jobs growth; • With state of the economy, high housing growth not needed; • Develop Northstowe and existing planned sites first; • Consider impact on traffic, locate homes with jobs; • Consider the needs of the local Traveller community as well as settled community. <p>Other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure needs to be improved / cannot cope. Ensure facilities are in place first (3). • Development should take place in other areas, Cambridge is full and the City and surrounding area are becoming spoilt (3). • Plan for natural population increase only (2). • High need for affordable housing, need homeless for the hidden homeless (e.g. Adults unable to move out of parental home). People cannot afford to get on property ladder (2). • Too much development leads to: traffic, loss of farmland, impact on village character, increased water stress, and impacts on quality of life (2). <p>Question 4B</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be the focus of development; • CPRE – Should be the minimum figure; • Gallagher Estates – 500 per year reasonable after 2021, due to economic improvements, A14 increased capacity, Guided Bus, construction in 2 or 3 separate phases with a range of housing providers, new secondary school will have opened; • Weston Colville Parish Council – Support. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead in time and delivery rate likely to slip; • Evidence from Cambourne shows lower rates, first residents were on site at Cambourne in 1999, and at 2012 2,600 dwellings had been built; • Cambourne has not maintained its highest delivery rates; • Delivery of new settlements consistently poor due to complexities
--	--

	<p>of delivery;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be delayed by A14 improvements, not planned until 2018; • 300 per annum more likely; • RLW Estates – 400 per year should be assumed; • Will be 2900 or 2250 less over plan period; • Fen Ditton Parish Council - Should be faster, to make best use of the site; • Milton Parish Council – only 1500 before A14 improvements. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – In terms of drainage, no issue with 500 dwelling per year; • Cambourne Parish Council - Need infrastructure at the outset; • Cottenham Parish Council – Reasonable target, but Council cannot afford to have its plan stalled by developers; • Essential that there is not a monopoly of provision. As many landowners and developers as possible should be involved in the development of Northstowe. If the parcels of land are provided in different parts of the site and particularly if they are accessed from different points, it will be possible to secure a higher rate of development. <p>Issues and Options 2 Part 1 Chapter 5</p> <p>Support: Fenland District Council – important two councils meet their objectively assessed need.</p> <p>Object: Councils need to establish their objectively assessed needs before planning the strategy. Need to use higher growth figures, and respond to economy led scenarios; Should only plan for local people. Large scale growth will undermine quality of life;</p>
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>The NPPF says that plans should make every effort to objectively identify and then meet housing needs, taking account of market signals.</p> <p>Additional evidence has been published since both the Issues and Option 1 and 2 Consultations have been carried out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 (SHMA) - April 2013. • The Memorandum of Co-operation - May 2013 <p>These documents have been used by the Council to inform both the jobs and housing figures within the Local Plan.</p> <p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to have a clear</p>

understanding of housing needs in their area. To achieve this, they should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. This is a key part of the evidence base to address the NPPF requirement of ensuring that local plans meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework.

The Cambridge Housing Market Area includes South Cambridgeshire and the other four Cambridgeshire districts plus Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury districts in Suffolk and Peterborough City. These eight authorities have worked together to collaborate on a new chapter of the Cambridge Sub Region SHMA (chapter 12), which identifies the scale and mix of housing needed across the area by 2031 (and extending to 2036 for Huntingdonshire to meet its proposed local plan end date). Integral to this is a separate Technical Report, which provides an overview of the national, sub-national and local data drawn upon to inform the levels of housing need set out in the SHMA. This has been used by the Council to inform its jobs and housing numbers to be included in the Local Plan.

The outcome of this work on the SHMA is that an additional 93,000 homes are forecast to be needed across the housing market area between 2011 and 2031. The table below sets out the breakdown of this total figure in more detail.

District	All dwelling change 2011 to 2031
Cambridge	14,000
East Cambridgeshire	13,000
Fenland	12,000
Huntingdonshire	17,000 (21,000 to 2036)
South Cambridgeshire	19,000
Cambridgeshire	75,000
Forest Heath	7,000
St Edmundsbury	11,000
Housing sub-region	93,000

The SHMA has provided information on objectively assessed needs for housing for all the districts in reviewing their planning policies and in particular in determining housing targets in their local plans.

In this regard, it should be noted that the Peterborough housing market area overlaps into Cambridgeshire. Peterborough is the largest urban centre within the travel to work area for the

Cambridgeshire sub-region and is a major employment location with good transport links and infrastructure. On the basis of currently available figures, it has a net daily in-commute from Cambridgeshire of around 7,000 people. Peterborough has an up to date Local Plan (Core Strategy adopted in 2011 and a Site Allocations DPD adopted in 2012) with a substantial housing growth target of 25,450 between 2009 and 2026.

Based on this background and engagement between all the local authorities under the Duty to Co-operate, it is acknowledged by the authorities that Peterborough, in its up to date Local Plan, has already accommodated a proportion of the housing need arising in the Cambridge Housing Market Area, and it has been agreed that this proportion could reasonably be assumed to amount to approximately 2,500 homes (i.e. around 10% of its overall housing target).

Separately, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire District Councils have made considerable progress to date with their local plan reviews and, therefore, have established a good understanding of their areas' development opportunities and constraints. They have also taken account of the July 2012 joint statement by Peterborough and the Cambridgeshire authorities which confirmed that the 'strategy is to secure sustainable development by locating new homes in and close to Cambridge and Peterborough and to other main centres of employment, while avoiding dispersed development' .

Based on all of the above, and agreement between all the local authorities working within the Duty to Co-operate, it has been agreed that, in their Local Plans, provision should be made for 11,000 dwellings in Fenland and 11,500 dwellings in East Cambridgeshire, rather than the full identified need set out in the table above.

Overall and taking account of the 2,500 dwelling element of the Cambridge HMA's need already met in Peterborough's Local Plan, this leaves 90,500 dwellings to be provided in the Cambridge HMA to ensure that the full objectively assessed need for housing in the Cambridge HMA will be met in forthcoming Local Plan reviews. The level of provision to be made by district is set out in the table below.

District	All dwelling provision 2011 to 2031
Cambridge	14,000
East Cambridgeshire	11,500
Fenland	11,000
Huntingdonshire	17,000 (21,000 to 2036)

South Cambridgeshire	19,000
Cambridgeshire	72,500
Forest Heath	7,000
St Edmundsbury	11,000
Total	90,500

The Localism Act 2011 places a Duty to Co-operate on local planning authorities. This requires them to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of development plan documents where this involves strategic matters and to be able to demonstrate having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts. The preparation of the new chapters in the SHMA demonstrates how the councils within the Cambridge Housing Market Area have carried out this duty.

This collaborative working has been formally acknowledged by all the districts within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation which has been recently produced. The purpose of this memorandum is to formally record and make public the local authorities' agreement under the Duty to Cooperate to the position as set out in this Memorandum, subject to ratification by their full Council as part of their individual Local Plan preparation.

The eight authorities that form signatories to the memorandum agree, therefore, that the figures in the table above (and taking account of provision already met within Peterborough) represent the agreed level of provision by district in order to meet the overall identified need for additional housing within the Cambridge Sub Region Housing Market Area.

The SHMA identifies the objectively assessed need for 19,000 new homes in South Cambridgeshire by 2031. This takes account of natural change in the existing population, including demographic changes such as an aging population, having regard to the latest information available, including the 2011 Census. It also takes account of forecast migration to South Cambridgeshire to support growth in the local economy. A number of economic forecasts and scenarios were also taken into account in identifying the level of housing need. The Council considers that this provides a technically robust forecast of objectively assessed housing needs over the plan period and is consistent with the approach required by the NPPF. The figure is between the Medium and Low options consulted on in 2012 and close to the Low figure. It relates to the objectively assessed needs figure for additional jobs being generated by the East of England Forecasting Model (EEFM), as were the options consulted on in 2012. The SHMA figure is therefore the most appropriate to include in the Local Plan as the

	<p>housing target.</p> <p>The figure of 19,000 new homes implies an average delivery rate of 950 homes per year which is less than the 1,176 homes annualised average in the Core Strategy 2007. It still represents a step change in housing delivery over a lengthy period. Completions have been around 600 to 700 dwellings a year in the four years since the beginning of the recession and achieved an average of 768 dwellings a year over the ten year period 2001-2011, with the highest figure achieved immediately before the recession of 1,274.</p> <p>The SHMA confirms that there is no additional outstanding backlog arising from the Local Development Framework.</p> <p>The phasing delivery and monitoring policy requires the monitoring of delivery of homes and to respond if it appears that policies and allocations are not being achieved or more up to date forecasts suggest that the objectively assessed needs of South Cambridgeshire require different levels of development and identifies a number of mechanisms that could be used in response.</p> <p>Taking account of all forms of housing supply, comprising: completions in 2011-12 the first year of the plan period of 696 homes; supply of housing on the major sites expected by 2031 of 11,113 homes; and commitments on smaller rural sites with planning permission or allocated for 2,220 homes, in 2012 the Council had a supply of 14,000 homes towards the 19,000 home target. This required sufficient new land to be identified to deliver a further 5,000 new homes in the district between 2011 and 2031.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	<p>Policy S/5: Provision of New Jobs and Homes Policy S/12: Phasing, Delivery and Monitoring</p>
Policy S/5: Provision of New Jobs and Homes (and Paragraphs 2.34 to 2.41)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 85 Support: 11 Object: 74</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council, Fenland District Council, St Edmundsbury Borough Council - welcome commitment to deliver 22,000 additional jobs and 19,000 new homes in the plan period, which is in line with the apportionment of homes across Cambridgeshire as agreed in the May 2013 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We desperately need more homes to increase supply and keep housing affordable. 19,000 homes is a MINIMUM. • Support planning for the objectively assessed need. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Haslingfield Parish Council – Concerned that targets are overly large and based on previous growth rates. • Petition of 2,242 signatures entitled Save the Cambridge Green Belt states that plans are based on out of date growth forecasts. • Targets based on modelling are unreliable. Replace with a more flexible market-led approach that is attuned to local supply and demand. • Over estimates jobs growth, and therefore housing need. • Too much development for the area. Pressure on infrastructure. Targets should be based on meeting local needs, rather than focusing on provision of jobs which will bring even more people to the area. • Should build more housing in other areas of the UK. • There has been no sub-district analysis of where needs are based. • Sites identified in the plan exceed the need identified, and make assumptions about need beyond 2031 that might prove to be totally inappropriate. • Should not assume SHMA assessment should be the target. Lower levels of growth also have benefits. • Should be clear how much affordable housing will be delivered. • Not clear how much housing will be for older people. • Targets should be increased to bring forward new settlements more quickly. • Target based on past trends of under-delivery. • Considerable immediate need for affordable housing based on historic under-delivery. • Has not used latest census data or data on migration. • Fall in household size has been underestimated. • Housing need should be minimum of 21,500 to meet in full objectively assessed needs and affordable housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existing target is a reduction compared to adopted target. ○ Approach agreed in Memorandum of Cooperation has not sought to tackle affordable housing needs of has ignored the findings of the SHMA. ○ The housing target will need to be increased above this level because there would be a shortfall of 7,300 dwellings arising from the Cambridge City Draft Local
--	--

	<p>Plan 2014.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does not meet NPPF requirements to boost supply of housing. ○ Has not used most up to date census information. ○ Has not taken account of market signals. ○ Occupancy rates not consistent with other authorities. ○ Age structure not properly addressed. ○ Ignored historic undersupply. ○ No account taken of student housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Housing needs should be minimum of 24,500: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lack of AH exacerbated by backlog from 2004 Local Plan and Core Strategy. ○ Affordability ratio has risen significantly since 2001. Will not boost housing supply as required by NPPF. ○ Flaws in methodology for demographic projections. Larger household size than national average. ○ Affordable housing need is 62% of proposed housing requirement which is highly unlikely to meet AH needs in full. ○ Aging population not adequately addressed. ○ Fails to take account of market signals and strength of demand. ○ Appropriate use of SHMA questioned – updating chapters one at a time means no up to date and comprehensive conclusion that draws on full extent of SHMA taking all chapters together, including all homes being published before affordable housing needs so that objectively assessed needs not informed by up to date AH need. ○ Not adequately aligned with jobs requirements and likely to result in increased commuting from outside the district and could constrain growth in the local economy. ○ City Council not providing sufficient housing to meet its OAN and this will have implications for South Cambs housing strategy ● Need for 19,100 dwellings in plan period for Cambridge, and 25,300 in South Cambridgeshire. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would deliver the step change in development. ○ Support growth potential in local economy. ● Need to consider higher growth targets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does not make every effort or respond positively to wider opportunities for growth as required by NPPF. ○ Is 25% lower job creation than in 1991-2011. Should plan to meet the high growth scenario which would
--	--

	<p>require higher housing growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City and South Cambs are together planning for 33,000 homes to support 44,000 jobs. Likely to lead to increased commuting, predominantly by car so increasing carbon emissions. ○ Projection methodology flawed based on projections of past trends that sought to restrict housing growth close to Cambridge and house prices have risen so that so called need is not a reflection of the real needs of the Cambridge area but simply a reflection of the restraint policies that put constraints above housing needs, contrary to the NPPF. Points to flaw in CCC's population forecasting by being based on a given planned dwelling stock not housing need. Based on under delivery (shortfall of 4,087 from 2001-2011). ○ Affordable housing need of almost 12,000 leaves 7,000 to meet market needs which is unlikely to be sufficient to sustain economic performance and would be likely to drive prices higher and force more people into housing need <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Housing target should be increased to 20,600 because of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Acute affordability and high migration economic forecast. ○ South Cambs is the logical location for the 2000 shortfall from East Cambs and the target should therefore be 22,600. ○ Delivery of some of the sites proposed in Cambridge is uncertain. ● Insufficient land allocated for employment. An additional 112,700 sq m of employment floor space on 31 ha of land is needed. This represents an additional 2,700 jobs. ● Employment land target will also fail to meet the specific need for high-tech manufacturing development. ● The policy states that 'development will meet' the specified target, and paragraph 2.36 states that 'the number of jobs is a forecast and not a target to be met at all costs'. This inconsistency needs to be resolved. ● Para 2.37 seems to indicate the tone for the strategy in which the housing figures of 19,000 are the upper limit of delivery, rather than a target which can be exceeded if there is a need. Should not be revised down.
Assessment	Support from other Councils party to the Memorandum of Cooperation on the apportionment of objectively assessed housing needs identified in the Cambridge Sub Region SHMA is welcomed.

	<p>The district Council has been working closely with the other authorities in the Cambridge Sub Region Housing Market Area (HMA) to identify housing needs in the HMA as a whole, as well as by district, and to ensure they are met in full through the signing of the Memorandum of Cooperation. Both the Council and Cambridge City Council have committed to meeting in full the housing requirement identified for their areas in the SHMA. The housing target in the Local Plan fully meets the level of objectively assessed needs for South Cambridgeshire identified in the Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (May 2013). The NPPF requires the plan to fully meet the objectively assessed needs for South Cambridgeshire unless it cannot do so. To do so sustainably does however require planning wholly new towns and villages.</p> <p>The SHMA provides an up to date assessment of housing needs in the wider Cambridge area and meets the requirements of the NPPF. The SHMA is supported by the Population, Housing and Employment Forecasts Technical Report 2013 that identifies a robust level of housing need that includes consideration of a wide range of available forecasts and projections to assess future population and economic growth. This includes from demographic forecasts, economic-led models, and up to date information from the 2011 Census. It therefore takes account of up to date assessments of forecast additional jobs in identifying future population. This is particularly important in the location with strong economic growth where in-migration comprises a significant proportion of total housing needs. The Technical Report identifies an indicative population figure for each district that encapsulates, within a single figure, the overall outlook for the district's population in 2031, on the balance of the available forecasts.</p> <p>Using population instead of households as the starting point for an assessment of future housing demand enables comparison of the widest range of projections and forecasts, both demographic and economic-led. This enables comparison and corroboration between different projections and forecasts, without relying on any single source. Relying on household projections may not address sufficiently the need for future housing provision, because these projections are likely to reflect suppressed household formation due to past under-supply of housing. The alternative approach using a Census-based assessment of total expected population provides a basis for determining a housing demand figure that is free from such constraints. The forecasts and projections considered were adjusted to reflect the actual population from Census 2011. There is therefore no backlog of supply to address. The anticipated population increase was then run through the East of England Forecasting model to provide figures for both jobs and</p>
--	---

	<p>homes that are commensurate with each other. A range of other factors were also taken into account, including: market factors, appropriate occupancy ratios (drawing on 2011 Census information and including a future fall in occupancy ratios reflecting the regional trend of an ageing population), and the up to date assessment of affordable housing need.</p> <p>The resulting objectively assessed housing need was benchmarked against the CLG-based How Many Homes toolkit. For the Cambridge HMA as a whole, a total increase for 2011-31 of 93,000 homes is higher than the How Many Homes figure of 87,700. The picture for South Cambridgeshire follows a similar pattern with 19,000 compared with 18,200 homes.</p> <p>The SHMA also provides evidence of the objectively assessed need for additional jobs during the plan period, taking account of the nature of employment in the wider Cambridge area. The implications for employment land requirements are addressed in Chapter 8.</p> <p>The SHMA is considered to provide a robust assessment of objectively assessed housing needs as required by the NPPF and the objections put forward that the housing target for the district should be higher, mainly by promoters of sites not included in the Local Plan, are not accepted. The approach taken in the SHMA provides for the collective total of population change in both the HMA and in South Cambridgeshire specifically, and the planned dwellings represent a challenging level of growth that will significantly boost the supply of housing.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 5	Windfall Allowance								
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment • Annual Monitoring Report 2010 - 2011 								
Existing policies	n/a								
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework says that an allowance may be made for windfall sites in the 5-year supply if local planning authorities have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance must be realistic having regard to the SHLAA, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens.</p> <p>Windfall development is housing that comes forward on land that is not specifically allocated in Plans. The NPPF now amplifies that it does not include development on residential gardens. However, it does allow an allowance to be included in housing land supply calculations again, having been dropped in the last round of national guidance.</p> <p>The Council argued when preparing the current plan that it could demonstrate a steady supply of windfalls over a long period of time and that the plan policies allowing development on unallocated land to come forward within village frameworks where certain tests were met would see this trend continue. Under national policy at that time, the Inspectors were not persuaded that there were the necessary exceptional circumstances required to allow such an approach.</p> <p>The change in the NPPF means that it is now appropriate to revisit the issue of windfalls and potentially include an allowance for such development.</p> <p>All windfalls have averaged over 200 dwellings per year for many years.</p> <p>Windfall Housing Completions Since 1991</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="491 1803 1252 1964"> <thead> <tr> <th>Time Period</th> <th>Windfalls</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1999-2001 *</td> <td>396</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001-2002 **</td> <td>186</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002-2003</td> <td>222</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Time Period	Windfalls	1999-2001 *	396	2001-2002 **	186	2002-2003	222
Time Period	Windfalls								
1999-2001 *	396								
2001-2002 **	186								
2002-2003	222								

	2003-2004	190
	2004-2005	194
	2005-2006	not known
	2006-2007	236
	2007-2008	551
	2008-2009	216
	2009-2010	319
	Source: SCDC Monitoring/Cambridgeshire County Council Monitoring	
	* this covers the period from July 1999 to June 2001.	
	** this covers the period from July 2001 to March 2002.	
	The remaining years are financial years.	
	<p>There is a fairly consistent number of windfall sites that come forward every year. This is an average of 251 dwellings per annum over the 10 years (if 2005-2006 is excluded from the calculations). No account has so far been taken in this monitoring information to identify how many of those windfall dwellings were on garden land. There will be some, but equally some windfall sites are redevelopment of brownfield land for example. A review of the windfall sites will be undertaken to identify how many meet the NPPF definition of windfall and the case for a windfall allowance considered further.</p> <p>The case for a windfall allowance will also be affected by the policies that are chosen to be included in the new Local Plan that will allow windfall development to come forward. The more flexible they are the greater the case for a windfall allowance and vice versa.</p> <p>The amount of new housing land that would need to be allocated in the new Plan would be reduced if a windfall allowance is included in the Plan.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: To include a windfall allowance or not, depending on the refined evidence in respect of garden land.</p>	
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.	
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 5: Do you consider that the Plan should include an allowance for windfall development?	

Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	A largely technical issue, as to whether housing predicted to happen but not identified in plans should be counted towards supply.
Representations Received	Support:77; Object: 38; Comment: 16
Key Issues from Representations	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide for the required new homes in the district and allow for greater flexibility in the delivery of new dwellings, the Plan should include an allowance for windfall development. Over the past 20 years an average of around 200 dwellings a year have come forward from sites that have not been specifically allocated in Plans. This source of housing development is important in maintaining the variety and flexibility of the overall supply of new housing for the plan period. • Inclusion of windfalls would avoid having to allocate more sites than necessary to meet targets. • Small developments can help maintain village schools and services • Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council – Windfalls can make a significant contribution and should include rural exception sites. • Can be appropriate if on a small scale and village character is protected (various comments about what counts as small scale including 5, 8, 10 or an unspecified higher number of dwellings). • Yes, but not if involving the loss of large houses and gardens. • Yes, but making an allowance for the diminishing potential as sites are used up. Suggest a 25% reduction to 150 per year. • Caldecote Parish Council – Yes otherwise more greenfield sites will be needed. • Whaddon, Weston Colville, Steeple Morden, Papworth Everard, Over, Madingley, Little Abington, Litlington, Histon & Impington, Great and Little Chishill, Great Abington, Grantchester, Gamlingay, Foxton, Fowlmere, Fen Ditton, Croydon, Coton, Comberton, and Caxton Parish Councils – Support • Ickleton Parish Council – Support but emphasis should be on their development for small homes. • Milton Parish Council – Support, allows village children to live in the village. • Waterbeach Parish Council – Allows developments to be more easily assimilated in the village. Helps avoid loss of greenfield sites. • The guidance in the NPPF does not qualify the size of the potential windfall. It makes it clear that larger sites can also be windfall, such as the former cement works at Barrington.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenham Parish Council – Such provision can at least count towards the required ‘buffer’. • Yes, but at a cautious level of 100 per year due to economic circumstances. • Provided that parish councils have the power of veto over exception sites and that the focus is on providing local homes for local people <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fact that 200 dwellings per year have been achieved for the past 20 years does not constitute the compelling evidence required by the NPPF given the intentions of the plan-led system to identify as many sites as possible and the inevitability of reducing capacity as a result of urban intensification. • Village infill has already gone too far to the detriment of village character. • The plan should aim to allocate sites to meet identified housing need to provide certainty to developers and landowners. • Over reliance on small windfall sites would greatly reduce the amount of affordable homes that could be provided. • Great Shelford Parish Council – Would involve loss of gardens. • Rampton Parish Council –Windfalls can be open to abuse. • The plan should not include an allowance for windfall development as the NPPF discourages such an approach. The Council has a record of under-delivery and consequently the 200 windfall dwellings per annum should only contribute towards 20% additional dwellings requirement to provide greater flexibility and ensure a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply as required by Policy 47 of the NPPF. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens • Windfalls arise from infill development and cause a loss of rural character. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Such provision can be included if it can be properly justified, but it should not be a substitute for making site allocations to meet identified needs over a 5-15 year period. • Such provision is unpredictable and cannot be relied on. Enough sites to meet all the identified need should be included in the plan. . • The supply of such sites will reduce in future as sites are used up, and because past rates included development on gardens which can no longer count in the supply. The plan
--	--

	<p>should allocate enough sites to meet identified needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such developments are increasingly unviable due to development costs and existing land use values. • The plan should not contain a windfall allowance. Whilst SCDC averaged 200 dwellings per year on windfall sites, a high proportion of this has been on small sites in the villages. This is not a sustainable form of development and one which the 'focussed' strategy of the Core Strategy and the new Local Plan should seek to reduce. It would therefore be contrary to the sustainable objectives of the Plan to assume windfalls at a rate of 200 per year for the next 20 years (4000 dwellings). <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barton Parish Council – Support use of small windfall sites. • Cambourne Parish Council – Such provision increases the flexibility of the plan. • Any windfall allowance should only be for a low percentage of the overall predicted supply. Allocated sites should provide the majority of housing provision across the District. Subject to the evidence showing that windfall provision is a realistic element of the supply. • Haslingfield Parish Council - This would allow for local development sponsored by individual villages to support perceived needs in Neighbourhood Plans • Policies in the new Local Plan must be supportive of such development if it is to be relied on as a source of supply.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework allows local authorities to make an allowance for windfall sites in their five-year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available and will continue to provide a reliable source of housing supply. In calculating any allowance, local authorities should take account of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens.</p> <p>The Council has fully allocated its housing requirement. The housing trajectory shows that existing completions and commitments and new allocations could provide 19,379 homes in the plan period. The Council has not relied on windfall sites even though it is confident that there will be a continuing supply of housing on such sites.</p> <p>Further analysis of windfalls carried out since the Issues & Options consultation in Summer 2012. This records the number of windfalls completed each year between 2006 and 2012, excluding any windfalls completed on garden land as required by the NPPF. The analysis shows that on average 208 windfalls have been</p>

completed. Rural exceptions sites for affordable housing have contributed significantly to windfall completions over the last 6 years.

Analysis of Historic Windfall Completions 2006-2012

	a. Total dwellings completed	d. Windfall dwelling completions
2006-07	924	170
2007-08	1,274	471
2008-09	610	170
2009-10	595	265
2010-11	655	217
2011-12	695	220
TOTAL	4,753	1,513

[All figures are based on net dwelling completions.]

Summary Data using all 6 years from 2006-2012

	Windfall dwelling completions excluding gardens
average per year	252

Summary Data using 5 years excluding 2007-2008

	Windfall dwelling completions excluding gardens
average per year	208

Based on this analysis, and excluding the windfalls that are already included in existing commitments, it is anticipated that windfalls could provide 2,900 dwellings in the plan period (as shown on the housing trajectory included in the draft Local Plan). However, these windfalls have not been relied on to meet the housing requirement; instead they provide greater flexibility and reassurance that delivery rates will be achieved and will help provide the 5-year supply buffer required by the NPPF.

Windfalls will come forward during the plan period and therefore rural settlement policies for different categories of village that are consistent with the level of local service provision and quality of

	public transport access will be included in the draft Local Plan to ensure that the scale of windfalls is compatible with their locations. These policies will not restrict the size of windfalls in the most sustainable Rural Centres and will reduce the size of windfall development that can take place moving down the village categories so that it is controlled in the least sustainable areas of the district whilst enabling the recycling of land and delivering new homes to meet local housing needs. All new development must be of high quality design and, as appropriate to the scale and nature of the development, must comply with the design principles policy.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 9	Development Strategy
Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1) Question 1 (and representations on paragraphs in chapters 3 to 8)	
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire Development Study (2009) - Consultants WSP in association with Pegasus Planning, SQW Consulting and Cambridge Econometrics • Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Development Strategy Review 2012 - Cambridgeshire Joint Strategy Unit • Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 • Cambridge Sub-Region Gypsy & Travellers Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 • Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Development Strategy Review 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Village Services and Facilities Study 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Village Classification Report 2012 • Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Economic Assessment 2010 • South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11
Existing policies	<p>Core Strategy DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ST/2 Housing Provision; • ST/4 Rural Centres; • ST/5 Minor Rural Centres; • ST/6 Group Villages;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ST/7 Infill Villages.
<p>Analysis</p>	<p>The Current Development Strategy</p> <p>The current development strategy for the Cambridge area was originally conceived in the Regional Plan for East Anglia in 2000 and confirmed and refined in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the East of England Plan 2008. The first two plans fell away some time ago with the last abolished by Government in January 2013. The current strategy for the district is provided by the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework documents adopted between 2007 and 2010.</p> <p>A significant number of new jobs have been created in and close to Cambridge over the last 20 years. New jobs will need new employees and the aim has been to provide as a greater number of new homes than previously as close to the jobs in and around Cambridge as possible, with the aim of providing a better balance between jobs and homes in and close to Cambridge, to help reduce commuting and congestion and providing a more sustainable pattern of development. That has resulted in high levels of planned growth in both employment and housing in South Cambridgeshire, and the expectation of significant in-migration into the district to provide the new workers to support the new jobs; 80% at the time of the Structure Plan. This also reflects the physical and environmental constraints on Cambridge in providing enough housing to support the local economy, and some of the housing growth in South Cambridgeshire is to help provide that better balance.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy ST/2 identifies a development sequence that aims to provide sustainable patterns of development. It focuses first on Cambridge, then extensions to Cambridge on land now released from the Green Belt, followed by the new town of Northstowe with its links to Cambridge via the Guided Busway. It then looks to the market towns elsewhere in the County and only finally looks to more sustainable rural locations, described as Rural Centres and other villages. Policies ST/4, ST/5 ST/6 and ST/7 then define a rural settlement hierarchy categorising villages from the more sustainable to the least sustainable (this is reviewed at Issue 13).</p> <p>The development sequence approach plans for residents of new housing to be close to jobs, services and facilities and also have the opportunity to use sustainable methods of transport to</p>

	<p>access them. As part of the last round of plan making, the Green Belt around Cambridge was reviewed and a number of releases were made to provide new communities on the edge of the City. These included land in South Cambridgeshire at Trumpington Meadows, sites both sides of Huntingdon Road in North West Cambridge, Cambridge East, and potential for additional housing at Orchard Park.</p> <p>This focus on urban development resulted in a move away from the previous dispersed development strategy, which had seen relatively high levels of growth in South Cambridgeshire's villages over a number of decades. The current strategy has very little growth currently planned in villages, although windfall development is provided for within villages of appropriate scales depending on their relative sustainability.</p> <p>Development Strategy to 2031</p> <p>A key issue for the new Local Plan will be the extent to which the current development strategy remains the most appropriate strategy for the district or whether any alternative strategies should be considered to provide whatever levels of growth are chosen.</p> <p>Cambridge City Council is also reviewing its current Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and preparing a new Local Plan for the period to 2031. In view of the close relationships between the two districts, and the new duty to cooperate enshrined in national legislation, the Councils are working together on issues of shared interest, including the development strategy.</p> <p>The NPPF continues and adds to the emphasis on sustainable development. The principle of providing a better balance between jobs that form part of the Cambridge Cluster in and around to Cambridge and homes close to provide a more sustainable pattern of development that provides the opportunity for more people to live close to where they work and reduce travel, congestion and emissions in the area remains sound. Also where travel is necessary to focus development on high quality public transport routes.</p> <p>The current sustainable development strategy of housing-led and mixed use allocations have been tested only recently at examination and generally remain appropriate. The new Local Plan will need to be sure that in carrying forward any current allocations that they remain suitable, available and deliverable. In particular, the implications of Marshall deciding to stay at Cambridge Airport will need to be considered, as Cambridge</p>
--	---

	<p>East will not now be developed, meaning that a key element of the strategy has been lost that would have provided land for about 7,500 dwellings in South Cambridgeshire and a strategic location for new employment, and the approach to any development at Cambridge East, including any land that could come forward without the Airport relocating is an issue for the plan, is dealt with in chapter 13.</p> <p>The current development strategy is best described as urban focused, with very limited new development for housing or employment located at villages. The few housing allocations that were carried forward have largely now been developed and rural development is mainly limited to completing the new village of Cambourne, making best use of brownfield sites, such as Bayer Crop Science and Ida Darwin Hospital, and windfall development within village frameworks compatible with their place in the rural settlement hierarchy. However, the urban focus is shared between Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe, in view of the limitations on releasing more land from the Green Belt compatible with Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>The development strategy moving forwards needs to be flexible to deal with potentially rapidly changing circumstances, particularly taking account of the unusual market conditions that exist at the time of writing the plan, the wider international uncertainties, and the challenges of predicting the economy of the country and locally over the next few years, let alone the next 20 years.</p> <p>The Council considers that within the wider framework of sustainable development set by the NPPF, the options for the focus of the development strategy continue to be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If possible, focus more development on the edge of Cambridge – this is the most sustainable location in South Cambridgeshire and has best access to services, facilities and jobs. The loss of Cambridge East has significantly reduced the supply of housing land on the edge of Cambridge for the new Local Plan. The question exist was whether a further review of the Green Belt would identify significant new development options which would not undermine the purposes of Cambridge’s Green Belt. • Focus more development through one or more new settlement – this is the next most sustainable option available to the Council in terms of the opportunity to provide a scale of development that could provide a significant level of local services and facilities (in particular be large enough to support a secondary school) and have the critical mass needed to provide potential for enhanced
--	--

	<p>high quality public transport links to Cambridge, similar to the service the Guided Busway will provide for Northstowe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on development at the more sustainable villages that have the best levels of services and facilities and accessibility by public transport and cycle to Cambridge and to a lesser extent to a market town. • A combination of the above. <p>In considering development at villages, the focus on sustainable villages is guided by the presumption in the NPPF on sustainable development, which means that the search for site options for consultation will start at the most sustainable locations in the district and move down the sequence which becomes less sustainable at each stage. As in the current development strategy, there will be no need to look further down the development sequence for site options than necessary to provide sufficient choice of site options from which to draw the preferred set of sites for allocation for housing development following consultation. The identification of site options is therefore focused on the larger, better served villages. These are identified in Issue 13.</p> <p>The site options are considered at Issue 16. They have been informed by the site assessments carried out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). These assessments have been brought together and an overall assessment carried out of their potential for housing. The assessment has been carried out and published for all SHLAA sites received, including for all Group villages. In the event, Issue 16 concludes that site options exist in the more sustainable larger villages to provide sufficient flexibility to identify sites to meet the housing target options included in the Issues & Options consultations, and no site options at Group villages (those not proposed for upgrade at Issue 13) were put forward for consultation.</p> <p>The Council is aware that some smaller villages indicated that they would like to see some additional development. The Council explored the issue through consultation, particularly through Issue 7: Localism and Relationship with Development Plans, Issue 14: Scale of Development at Villages and Issue 15: Approach to Village Frameworks.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire,</p>

	<p>including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Issues and Options 2012</p> <p>Question 9: What do you think is the best approach to the development strategy for South Cambridgeshire? All options are expected to need to involve some village development to provide flexibility and early housing provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Cambridge focus (would require a review of the Green Belt) ii. New Settlement focus iii. Sustainable Villages focus (would require a review of the Green Belt) iv. Combination of the above <p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1) Chapters 3-8</p> <p>Question 1: Where do you think the appropriate balance lies between protecting land on the edge of Cambridge that is of high significance to Green Belt purposes and delivering development away from Cambridge in new settlements and at better served villages?</p>
<p>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</p>	<p>The option considers a range of broad strategies for growth. Actual impacts on many objectives would depend on the specific site options identified for development, and are explored elsewhere.</p> <p>An edge of Cambridge (option i) would involve Green Belt development. As Green Belt is designated to protected landscape and townscape character, a significant negative impact on the objective has been identified, although the scale and nature of the impact would vary. In terms of sustainable transport this option has the best potential to support journeys by sustainable modes, by proving homes closest to the largest concentration of jobs (Cambridge). It also has a positive impact on the access to services and facilities objective.</p> <p>The new settlement (option ii) has potential to address transport, as the quantity of development could enable significant transport</p>

	<p>investment. If designed as a sustainable settlement, it could also be developed with a mix of uses with both employment delivering jobs locally and its own services and facilities of higher order than with village focused development, although it will still provide homes a greater distance from Cambridge than the Cambridge focused option. Impact on landscape would again depend on the site, but the scale of a new settlement means in is likely to have a significant negative impact on the landscape objective.</p> <p>The sustainable village focus (option iii) would focus development on the rural settlements where there is the best access to services and facilities and best public transport, rather than smaller villages where they would be less available. However, the distances to Cambridge would be greater than the Cambridge focused option. There are likely to be less opportunities to deliver sustainable transport than the new settlement option. Impact on the landscape could be less, as it may result in smaller sites and greater distribution of development, but village expansions could still impact on village character. The most sustainable villages are located in the Green Belt close to Cambridge. This could therefore mean a review of the Green Belt, or development in the next band of settlements, which have a lower level of services and facilities.</p> <p>A combined approach (option iv) is more difficult to assess, as the balance between the options will determine how it performs against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>An option considering less sustainable villages (group and infill villages) was considered (option v). This would have significant adverse impacts on access to services and facilities, employment, and sustainable transport. This option has therefore been rejected.</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>Question 9: Cambridge focus (would require a review of the Green Belt): Support: 38; Object: 30; Comment: 3 Questionnaire Question 3 (where a specific preference was expressed): Support: 44 Object: 17</p> <p>New Settlement focus: Support: 57; Object: 35; Comment: 10 Questionnaire Question 3: Where do you think that development should be focused? (where a specific preference was expressed): Support: 486 Object: 111</p> <p>Sustainable Villages focus (would require a review of the Green Belt): Support: 27; Object: 28; Comment:14 Questionnaire Question 3 Where do you think that development should be focused? (where a specific preference was</p>

	<p>expressed): Support: 40 Object: 39</p> <p>Combination of the above: Support:61; Object: 17; Comment:16 Questionnaire Question 3 Where do you think that development should be focused? (where a specific preference was expressed): Support: 41 Object: 3</p> <p>Please provide any comments: Support: 18; Object: 7; Comment: 79</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 3 Where do you think that development should be focused? Total comments received: 707 (including those referenced above)</p> <p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1) Question 1: Support: 8; Object: 50; Comment: 229 Chapter 3: Support: 7 Object: 31 Comment: 8 Chapter 4: Support: 7 Object: 9 Comment: 7 Chapter 6: Support: 27 Object: 72 Comment: 35 Chapter 8: Support: 2 Object: 14 Comment: 13</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>Issues and Options 2012</p> <p>Question 9: What do you think is the best approach to the development strategy for South Cambridgeshire? All options are expected to need to involve some village development to provide flexibility and early housing provision:</p> <p><u>Cambridge Focus (i)</u></p> <p>Pro Development in and on the edge of Cambridge is the most sustainable option in terms of access to jobs, shops, services, and non-car travel modes.</p> <p>Con The Green Belt has been thoroughly reviewed and there is no more scope for major development. Harm to Green Belt purposes. Exceptional circumstances do not exist as there is scope to develop outside the Green Belt.</p> <p><u>New Settlement focus (ii)</u></p> <p>Pro Such a strategy would protect the Green Belt and the villages from development. New settlements come with new infrastructure.</p> <p>Con Less sustainable than a Cambridge focus strategy, new settlements have a long and unpredictable lead-in time.</p> <p><u>Village focus (iii)</u></p> <p>Pro Small sites so will be quick to deliver. Development can help to support local schools, shops and services.</p> <p>Con Unsustainable, lack of access to public transport, shops,</p>

jobs and services. Loss of village character and amenity.

Combination (iv)

Pro Most robust option in terms of delivery.

Con Harm to Green Belt purposes. New settlements have a long lead in time. Some loss of village character and amenity.

Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1)

Question 1: Where do you think the appropriate balance lies between protecting land on the edge of Cambridge that is of high significance to Green Belt purposes and delivering development away from Cambridge in new settlements and at better served villages?

Main Views Received:

- Concentrate development in new settlements and better served villages. This will reduce commuting and relieve congestion in Cambridge (37 reps).
- Concentrate development in new settlements with appropriate infrastructure. Village infrastructure cannot cope with more development (36 reps).
- Concentrate development in Cambridge (8 reps), and in urban extensions to Cambridge, where existing infrastructure can be used. (17 reps).
- Concentrate development in the better served villages (17 reps).
- Protect the Green Belt from development. It has recently been reviewed and releasing land in every plan would make the policy to protect it meaningless. Land is available elsewhere. It provides the setting for Cambridge, maintains its scale, protects the necklace villages and protects wildlife (77 reps)
- Cambridge is big enough already
- Need to support continued growth / growth is not a sign of success.
- Need to rebalance housing and jobs
- Should not revert back to a dispersal strategy
- Need to address climate change
- Need to fully consider transport impacts
- Focus on areas near rail
- Housing and economic needs provide exceptional circumstances to review green belt.
- Housing numbers on sites should be updated.
- Should consider more growth south of Cambridge near employment;
- Relying on new settlements will result in under delivery

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Cambridgeshire District Council, Fenland District Council - Welcome recognition of sequential approach. • East Cambridgeshire – need to consider the varied transport opportunities provided by new settlements.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>The Council has considered all the representations received and has worked closely with both Cambridge City and Cambridgeshire County Councils to determine the development strategy to be included in the draft Local Plan. A report was taken to the Joint Strategic Transport & Spatial Planning Group on 22 May 2013 on this matter. Appendix D of the joint member report provides a detailed review of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area, including a sustainability assessment of strategy options. (This has been included in the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report.)</p> <p>The preferred approach for the strategy for the Cambridge area is one that continues to recognise that, after the urban area of Cambridge, the edge of Cambridge is the next most sustainable location for growth in the development sequence. However the Sustainability Appraisal identifies the importance of balancing the accessibility aspects of sustainable development and the environmental and social benefits it brings, with the significant harm to the landscape and setting environmental aspects of sustainability that development on land in the Green Belt would have, with the resulting irreversible adverse impacts on the special character and setting of Cambridge as a compact historic city and the risks that could have to the economic success of the Cambridge area, which is in part built on its attractiveness as a place to live and work. The results of the consultation on the appropriate balance between edge of Cambridge or new settlements and better served villages were strongest to protect the Green Belt. The development sequence included in the Local Plan has been refined to clarify that the order of preference must have regard to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt as part of balancing the different aspects of sustainability. It also clarifies that the better served villages in the district are Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.</p> <p>Identifying the strategic site allocations at each stage of the sequence has taken account of the evidence base supporting Issues and Options 1 and 2, including the Sustainable Development Strategy 2012 and the Green Belt Review, as well as the Sustainability Appraisal of strategy options and of individual sites and packages of sites, of the results of transport modelling, and taking all this along with the results of consultation. This has resulted in the only site being proposed for housing within the district on the edge of Cambridge being a small expansion of the existing NIAB2 housing site in South Cambridgeshire between</p>

	<p>Huntingdon and Histon roads. This is not surprising given that the Green Belt was comprehensively reviewed following the adopted of the Structure Plan in 2003 and completed in the South Cambridgeshire Site Specific Policies DPD as recently as 2010.</p> <p>Without reasonable site options on the edge of Cambridge it has been necessary to development away from the Cambridge to meet remaining development needs. New settlements are the next most sustainable location for growth. They have the advantage of focusing growth so that developments can support higher levels of service provision and support greater infrastructure improvements, including sustainable transport measures, than are possible with a more dispersed development strategy. National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 52 says that the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities.</p> <p>Therefore the strategic options for new development in South Cambridgeshire focus on new settlements and previously established new settlements, with the reserve site at Northstowe identified in the Northstowe Area Action Plan being allocated as part of the new town, and new allocations for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New town based on Waterbeach Barracks • New village at Bourn Airfield • Expansion at Cambourne West <p>The first two new sites will come forward later in the plan period and continue developing beyond 2031. Without also including major expansion of Cambourne, a significant amount of development would be required at villages and would result in the sort of dispersed development strategy previously having been found to be unsustainable. The new town at Waterbeach will have a long lead in time and is only considered realistically to be able to provide housing in the last 5 years of the plan period. Bourn Airfield new village will also have a long lead in time, although less so than Waterbeach new town, and the plan delays its anticipated earliest start by two years to come forward slightly later in the plan period than it otherwise might as part of managing the overall housing supply. It also has the advantages that the remainder of Cambourne is well progressed before any development starts at Bourn Airfield. This will also help provide additional flexibility, particularly in terms of ensuring a continuous 5-year supply of housing land.</p> <p>The preference to allocate all three strategic sites was influenced by the long lead in times for new settlements which will therefore come forward later in the plan period and continue developing</p>
--	--

	<p>beyond 2031.</p> <p>Some support was offered in the representations received during the consultations for better served villages to provide for future development although to a lesser extent than new settlements. There was concern about the impact on infrastructure, and village character. Transport modelling has also shown that new settlements are able to provide a higher modal share by sustainable transport means than a strategy with significant levels of village based development. As a result there is only limited development proposed in the local plan at the more sustainable villages, which lie at the bottom of the search sequence – Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres - to provide flexibility and help ensure a continuous supply of housing land in the middle of the plan period, including if there is any delay in progress on any of the major sites. Development within villages will take account of opportunities to utilise previously developed land.</p> <p>Sufficient suitable sites are available at higher levels of the hierarchy, without relying on allocations in the smallest villages, which would lead to a dispersed pattern of development where the fewest services and facilities are available and they would not provide a sustainable form of development in the context of a district wide strategy. Therefore no sites were identified as options or are allocated at Group and Infill villages.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 11	Considering Exceptional Circumstances for a Green Belt review
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridge Green Belt Study - Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002 Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core Strategy DPD: ST/1 Green Belt; ST/2 Housing Provision Development Control Policies DPD: GB/1 Development in the Green Belt; GB/4 Major Developed Stes in the Green Belt
Analysis	<p>One of the options put forward at Issue 9 as part of consideration of the appropriate development strategy for the new Local Plan was to focus development on the edge of Cambridge. This would involve a review of the Cambridge Green Belt. A key issue for consideration was therefore to explore the principle of whether there should be more development on the edge of Cambridge and whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify the release of further land from the Green Belt to meet the housing and</p>

	<p>employment needs of the area.</p> <p>Given the tight administrative boundary and close interrelationship with South Cambridgeshire, both councils worked together to consider holistically how best to meet the needs of the wider Cambridge area, especially in relation to housing and employment. The current development strategy that came through the cooperative Structure Plan process in 2003, was based on the principle of providing as much housing as possible in and close to Cambridge, to create a better balance between jobs and homes, and to provide for the most sustainable development strategy consistent with protecting the most important qualities of Cambridge and the surrounding rural area and necklace villages.</p> <p>The councils considered how best to achieve a Green Belt boundary that is compatible with long term sustainable development, and whether this required the boundary to be revisited in this round of plan making against the background of a review which was completed relatively recently in the Cambridge Green Belt Local Plan 2006 and the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007 -2010. The process of delivering a new plan required these questions to be revisited as part of the necessary robust examination of all reasonable options for the development strategy moving forwards. This was particularly relevant in view of the change in circumstances at Cambridge East, which will no longer come forward in the next plan period to meet longer term development needs.</p> <p>The NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts whose essential characteristics are their openness and permanence. Green Belt boundaries can only be established in Local Plans and “once established can only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan”. For the current Local Development Framework, the exceptional circumstance was provided by the policies of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the objective of delivering a sustainable development strategy focusing new homes close to jobs in Cambridge. After the withdrawal of the majority of the Structure Plan, the approach was continued in the RSS. Green Belt guidance has always made clear that Green Belt boundaries should be drawn so that they can endure beyond the end of the plan period. Current inner Green Belt boundaries have been established in a suite of recent plans – the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, two Area Action Plans from 2008 and 2009 and in the South Cambridgeshire Site Specific Policies DPD from 2010. The Inner Green Belt Study 2002 and the Cambridge Green Belt Study 2002 informed the current Green Belt boundaries.</p>
--	--

	<p>When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. They should also ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development.</p> <p>In view of the need for additional housing allocations to meet development needs over the next 20 years and the need to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, a further review the Cambridge Green Belt was undertaken and completed in the autumn of 2012.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: NPPF is clear that Green Belts should only be reviewed through Local Plans where there are exceptional circumstances justifying such a review. It was therefore necessary to question whether such circumstances exist. Not undertaking a review was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 11: Do you consider that more land, beyond that already released and committed, on the edge of Cambridge and potentially at larger villages, should be released from the Green Belt in order to achieve sustainable development?</p> <p>Please provide any comments and explain why you think there are exceptional circumstances?</p> <p>(Issues and Options 2 Part 1 chapter 7 also addressed the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge)</p>

<p>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</p>	<p>In order to provide comparison two options have been appraised, one considering general impacts or a review (yes), an another considering the impacts of not reviewing the green belt (no). The impacts of a Green Belt review are similar to those described in the development strategy options above. Development, depending on the scale and location, has potential for significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. There could also be impact on biodiversity objectives. However, given the best access to services and facilities will be on the edge of Cambridge, or in rural centres located in the green belt, this has the most potential to address sustainable travel objectives.</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>Support: 53; Object: 174; Comment: 41 (plus 697 questionnaire comments (question 4), but with comments on broad locations recorded under Question 12)</p> <p>Issues and Options 2 Part 1 chapter 7 Support: 68; Object: 58; Comment: 29</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need housing in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, including affordable housing; • To replace Cambridge East; • Green Belt study 2002 out of date; • Green Belt boundaries should be capable of enduring long-term; • Because employers are looking for sites closer to Cambridge • Most sustainable approach to development needs, reflects NPPF; • Would mean all options assessed; • Could be used to enhance city • Limited non green belt sites available; • Around Cambridge, not villages; • Consider potential around villages as well; <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt continues to play an important role in protecting the setting of city and preventing urban sprawl; • Protects biodiversity; • Protects farmland; • Maintains accessible countryside for the City; • Focus on brownfield land, significant opportunities have been identified; • Not sustainable, will have environmental impacts; • Would add to traffic; • Village growth can meet development needs; • Very special circumstances do not exist; • Existing developments illustrate the damage caused by urban extensions;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last plan promised no further reviews; • Would merge Cambridge with villages, and harm character of the City; • Would impact on rural character, and landscape; • Comberton Parish Council - Supported by 301 signatories (of which 267 signatories have been individually registered). All 10 options would go against the spirit of the 2009 SSP inspector who noted: "The most relevant principles...are those concerned with the maintenance of views of the historic core of Cambridge, providing green separation between the urban expansion and existing settlements, and protecting green corridors." SCDC should resist the temptation to take away from the green belt. • The continued inclusion of the Scotsdales site in the Green Belt is anomalous given that it does not contribute towards any of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt and serves no useful planning purpose and is therefore unreasonable and unnecessary. The Council should therefore exclude the site from the Green Belt. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be necessary to stop development being forced away from Cambridge; • Not realistic around outlying Green Belt villages; • Need to consider transport impacts; • If there is adjustment, should add land elsewhere; • The Green Belt should be reinstated in South Cambs at Cambridge Airport • Cambridgeshire County Council - In the event that any change is made to the Cambridge Green Belt in Cambridge South the opportunity to address the outstanding need for a new Household Recycling Centre (HRC) to serve new and existing communities should be taken • English Heritage - The boundary of the Green Belt has only recently been reviewed and we do not consider that it can be justified to look for further extension into this landscape.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>The Council needs to achieve a Green Belt boundary that will endure into the future and that is compatible with long term sustainable development particularly in the light of the unavailability of Cambridge Airport at least during the lifetime of the new Local Plan. The edge of Cambridge is the next most sustainable location for growth in the development sequence after the urban area of Cambridge but a balance must be achieved between the benefits of the accessibility aspects of sustainable development and need to protect the special qualities of Cambridge as a compact historic city with an attractive setting protected by the Green Belt.</p>

	<p>The Council undertook a joint review of the inner Green Belt boundary with Cambridge City Council in 2012. The purpose of the review was to help the Councils reach a view on whether there were specific areas of land that could be considered for release from the Green Belt and allocated for development to meet their identified needs without significant harm to Green Belt purposes. The update found that most of the inner Green Belt continues to be of high importance for Green Belt purposes and specifically important to protect the setting and special character of Cambridge as a compact historic city. This is not surprising given that the Green Belt was comprehensively reviewed following the adopted of the Structure Plan in 2003 and completed in the South Cambridgeshire Site Specific Policies DPD as recently as 2010. The reduced areas of Green Belt adjacent to the previous releases have also gained a greater value. The Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012 therefore found that there were a limited number of small sites which are of lesser importance to Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>Given the level of need for homes and jobs, it is considered that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the release of land from the Green Belt, where it will not cause significant harm to the purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Councils have concluded that it is not appropriate to consider large Green Belt releases on the edge of Cambridge in addition to the extensive existing commitments as that would cause significant harm to the Green Belt and consulted in Issues and Options 2, Part 1 on 6 modest areas for release from the Green Belt, 2 of which are in South Cambridgeshire. The effect of this conclusion is to require development away from Cambridge to meet the remaining identified housing need. New settlements are the next most sustainable location for growth. The results of consultation supported concentration on new settlements rather than focus on edge of Cambridge due to Green Belt impacts.</p> <p>The majority of the Council's most sustainable villages lie in the Green Belt and the Council consulted on options in the Green Belt alongside consultation on whether exceptional circumstances existed to review the Green Belt. As addressed in Issue 16 about housing sites,</p> <p>The draft Local Plan proposes the release of land from the Green Belt in the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GB5 (land adjoining Peterhouse Technology Park / Fulbourn Road East) for employment development; • GB6 (NIAB3) as additional land in association with NIAB2
--	---

	<p>to enable the delivery of 1,000 homes on this combined site;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sawston for housing development; • Histon & Impington for housing development; and • Comberton for housing development. <p>A minor extension to the Green Belt has also been proposed to provide a countryside separation between Waterbeach village and the proposed new settlement planned for Waterbeach Barracks. The NPPF allows for additional areas of green belt to be established if there is a significant change in circumstances, such as the creation of a new settlement. The existing Green Belt extends to Waterbeach village and surrounds it on three sites. This small area of additional Green Belt on the fourth northern side of the village will be important for maintaining the village character of Waterbeach, and warrants the level of protection afforded by the Green Belt in order that it remains open.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <p>Scotsdales Garden Centre request that their site is removed from the Green Belt as the site does not contribute towards any of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.</p> <p>As stated in the Council’s evidence to the Site Specific Policies DPD examination, the land that is now the site of Scotsdales has been in the Green Belt since 1965 and therefore when the planning permission for the garden centre was approved in 1969 the site was in the Green Belt. The growth of site has taken place with the Green Belt designation in place and there has been no material change in circumstances to warrant its removal.</p> <p>The inspector examining the Local Development Framework only recently concluded that the exclusion of this site from the Green Belt is sound as most of the site is occupied by open parking areas, outside storage, and grassed / landscaped areas and most of the structures are of the glasshouse type or have one or more open sides. The scale and nature of development do not constitute such exceptional circumstances as to warrant changing the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council request that in the event that any change is made to the Green Belt in the south of Cambridge that the opportunity to address the outstanding need for a new Household Recycling Centre (HRC) to serve new and existing communities should be taken.</p>
--	---

	<p>The Inspector who examined the County Council Minerals & Waste Local Plan advised that there is no pressing need to make provision in the early years of the plan and recommended that the County undertakes a closely targeted review of its plans to allocate a site. South Cambridgeshire District and Cambridge City Councils have expressed a willingness to co-operate in such a targeted review.</p> <p>No development proposals have been consulted on as options for development on the south side of Cambridge for the new South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, so there are no large scale proposals which have been the subject of public consultation that could be incorporated into the draft Local Plan and which could include a Household Waste Recycling Centre.</p> <p>Without the review of the Minerals & Waste Local Plan it would not be possible to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances necessary to remove land from the Green Belt and safeguarding it for a Household Recycling Centre. Once this review has been undertaken, it is likely that a similar targeted review of the Local Plan would be necessary but only if the Waste Local Plan proposed a site in South Cambridgeshire.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	<p>Policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031 Policy SS/5: Waterbeach New Town Policy E/2: Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn) Policy H/1: Allocations for Residential Development at Villages</p>

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 12	Green Belt Locations
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11 • Cambridge Green Belt Study - Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002 • Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD: ST/1 Green Belt; ST/2 Housing Provision • Development Control Policies DPD: GB/1 Development in the Green Belt
Analysis	<p>In order to ensure that the testing process for the new Local Plan is robust, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council undertook a 2 stage approach to reviewing the land on the edge of Cambridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1: Issues & Options Consultation Summer 2012: Looked comprehensively at all possible broad locations where Green Belt boundaries could be reviewed to see if further land could be removed from the Green Belt.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 2: Issues & Options Consultation Winter 2012: Included a comparison with the relative sustainability of development elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, consultation on specific development site options. <p>Each broad location for the Stage 1 consultation was shown in Figure 3 of the Issues and Options Consultation document. Many of the broad locations cross the boundary with Cambridge, while others are entirely within one or other district. For the purposes of completeness, all broad locations on the edge of the city were addressed in the consultation. Comments were sought on all the broad locations including those in Cambridge to assist the Councils to take a coordinated approach on this important issue.</p> <p>All of the broad locations identified for testing could theoretically be built out for housing in whole or in part, taking account of planning constraints such as flooding, environmental designations or heritage assets. The suitability of land on the edge of Cambridge for housing will however turn on the principle of whether the Green Belt should be reviewed as part of developing a new sustainable development strategy for the Cambridge area, and if so, whether individual sites within broad locations could be released. A key issue will be whether such releases and the level of harm they would have on the purposes of the Green Belt including the setting of Cambridge and separation with necklace villages are considered on balance to be acceptable within the wider strategic framework.</p> <p>Assessments of each of the broad locations were undertaken jointly by the two Councils. The following information was provided for each broad location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and Context; • Designations and Constraints – heritage and environmental assets, planning policy designations, flooding and drainage, topography, pollution/noise; • Planning history – Previous plans, conclusions from Inspector’s reports, key planning applications; • Green Belt and Landscape – significance to Green Belt purposes, function with regard to character and setting, including rural character of the landscape; • Schools, Utilities and Services – existing services and facilities available, new facilities required to serve the development; • Transport – highway capacity, public transport, site access; • Availability and deliverability. <p>A comprehensive approach was taken to the Green Belt around Cambridge, jointly with Cambridge City Council, and the</p>
--	--

	<p>community's views are sought whether they think any of the broad locations listed here and assessed in Appendix 2 of the Issues and Options Consultation document have any potential for housing development, whether that may have been for a small area of development close to the built up area, or possibly a larger site.</p> <p>The broad locations were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land to the North & South of Barton Road (includes land in both districts) 2. Playing Fields off Grantchester Road, Newnham (includes land in both districts) 3. Land West of Trumpington Road (includes land in Cambridge only) 4. Land West of Hauxton Road (includes land in both districts) 5. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road (includes land in both districts) 6. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road between Babraham Road & Shelford Road (includes land in both districts) 7. Land between Babraham Road & Fulbourn Road (includes land in both districts) 8. Land East of Gazelle Way (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) 9. Land at Fen Ditton (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) 10. Land between Huntingdon Road & Histon Road (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) <p>The City Council included indicative capacities for land within its area. This was possible because of the tightly drawn administrative boundary, which means that there is a finite physical capacity in each location. The same did not apply to South Cambridgeshire and no capacities were included in the assessments, which would require making some judgment on the extent of land that should be used to determine capacity.</p> <p>Following consultation on the Issues and Options Report, all comments received were be assessed and subsequent consultation took place on reasonable site options with specific boundaries January/February 2013, prior to both the District Council and Cambridge City Council developing draft local plans.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Councils consider that given the significance of the Green Belt, the most appropriate approach was the 2-stage process being undertaken (broad areas and then sites), rather than move directly to stage 2 (sites).</p>
--	---

<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 12: Do you consider that any of the following broad locations have potential to be released from the Green Belt to provide new housing to help meet the needs of the Cambridge area? (tick any number of boxes):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land to the North & South of Barton Road (includes land in both districts) 2. Playing Fields off Grantchester Road, Newnham (includes land in both districts) 3. Land West of Trumpington Road (includes land in Cambridge only) 4. Land West of Hauxton Road (includes land in both districts) 5. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road (includes land in both districts) 6. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road between Babraham Road & Shelford Road (includes land in both districts) 7. Land between Babraham Road & Fulbourn Road (includes land in both districts) 8. Land East of Gazelle Way (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) 9. Land at Fen Ditton (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) 10. Land between Huntingdon Road & Histon Road (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) <p>Please provide any comments, and indicate the area of land at</p>

	the relevant broad location that you feel has potential, either in words or provide a map.
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	The Sustainability Appraisal focuses on general locations around the edge of Cambridge. As general locations, the scale or location of development could vary considerably, and therefore this could impact on specific impacts. This is reflected in the sustainability appraisal findings, which are available for each general location in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report 2012.
Representations Received	<p>1. Land to the North and South of Barton Road (including land in both districts) City: Support: 4; Object: 91 SCDC: Support: 5; Object: 55; Comment: 6</p> <p>2. Playing Fields off Grantchester Road, Newnham (includes land in both districts) City: Support: 1; Object: 69 SCDC: Support: 2; Object: 50; Comment: 4</p> <p>3. Land West of Trumpington Road (includes land in Cambridge only) City: Support: 1; Object: 64 SCDC: Support: 3; Object: 46; Comment: 3</p> <p>4. Land West of Hauxton Road (includes land in both districts) City: Support: 4; Object: 41 SCDC: Support: 7; Object: 52; Comment: 4</p> <p>5. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road (includes land in both districts) City: Support: 7; Object: 30 SCDC: Support: 9; Object: 45; Comment: 5</p> <p>6. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road between Babraham Road and Shelford Road (includes land in both districts) City: Support: 4; Object: 35 SCDC: Support: 6; Object: 40; Comment: 3</p> <p>7. Land between Babraham Road and Fulbourn Road (includes land in both districts) City: Support: 5; Object: 38 SCDC: Support: 6; Object: 72; Comment: 3</p> <p>8. Land East of Gazelle Way (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) City: Support: 7; Object: 15 SCDC: Support: 7; Object: 66; Comment: 6</p> <p>9. Land at Fen Ditton (includes land in South Cambridgeshire</p>

	<p>only) City: Support: 4; Object: 22 SCDC: Support: 9; Object: 45; Comment: 6</p> <p>10. Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) City: Support: 8; Object: 14 SCDC: Support:7; Object: 34; Comment: 5</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>1. Land to the North and South of Barton Road (including land in both districts)</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The release of sensitive Green Belt land around Cambridge is not unprecedented e.g. North West Cambridge. • Suitable site for residential development with employment, shops, schools, services and open space provision (including a wildlife reserve and country park). • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge area including for affordable housing, such need has been exacerbated by the lack of development at Cambridge East. • Close to West Cambridge, housing development here would complement its employment floorspace. • The location would encourage sustainable modes of transport. • Low density, well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development. • Substantial Green Belt release has only recently been sanctioned so further release should not be contemplated. There should be a settling in period of at least 10 years to allow for the impact of current developments on the edge of Cambridge to be assessed. • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful. • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge. Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city. Last remaining stretch of road into Cambridge not subject to urban sprawl. • The land is in a highly sensitive area of the Green Belt, which is important to the setting of the city and adjacent conservation area and forms an important approach to the city. Forms a vital part of the Quarter to Six Quadrant. • The site contains the remnants of the West Field and almost certainly contains archaeological remains. • The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area should be designated for playing fields and recreation. • Loss of a green lung for Cambridge which is easy to access on foot. • Loss of recreation facilities contrary to NPPF. • Would bring development closer to necklace villages. • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Barton Road already heavily congested. • Would bring more traffic through Grantchester. • Impact on local services and facilities. • Land close to Bin Brook is subject to flooding and development could increase flood risk downstream. • Noise and air quality concerns close to M11. • Site rejected in the past and nothing has changed to reduce the importance of the area. • Inadequate local infrastructure including schools and water supply. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Quarter to Six Quadrant should be preserved and enhanced. • A limited area may be possible to develop if well landscaped. <p>2. Playing Fields off Grantchester Road, Newnham (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge. • Low density, well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development. • Substantial Green Belt release has only recently been sanctioned so further release should not be contemplated. There should be a settling in period of at least 10 years to allow for the impact of current developments on the edge of Cambridge to be assessed. • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge. Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city. • The land is in a highly sensitive area of the Green Belt, which is important to the setting of the city and adjacent conservation area and forms an important approach to the
--	--

	<p>city. Forms a vital part of the Quarter to Six Quadrant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would bring development closer to Grantchester, bring more traffic through Grantchester and destroy the village feel of Newnham. • Harmful to tourism. • Would lead to the loss of a green finger running into the centre of Cambridge. • Impact on local services and amenities. Inadequate water supply to support development. • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Grantchester Road inadequate. Would lead to unacceptable levels of traffic on Barton Road and Fen Causeway which are already heavily congested. • Could lead to the loss of the allotments, which represent an important facility for the community. • Flood risk to rugby club land, development could exacerbate flooding to neighbouring properties. Could increase flood risk downstream. • Loss of playing fields should be resisted and is contrary to the NPPF. • The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species. The site forms an important wildlife corridor linking to the Backs and Grantchester Meadows. • Development of this site has been rejected in the past, and the reasons for this remain unchanged. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Quarter to Six Quadrant should be preserved and enhanced. • Perhaps a small development away from the River would be acceptable. <p>3. Land West of Trumpington Road (includes land in Cambridge only)</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge. • Well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable if away from river. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development. • The area forms a sensitive part of the Green Belt and should remain as such. It plays a very important part in the overall setting of the city and its rural edge is a vital characteristic of Cambridge that should be protected. • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South
--	--

	<p>Cambridgeshire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impact on the Southacre Conservation Area. New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge. Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city. • Would impinge on a Green Corridor and add to urban sprawl. Loss of green separation between Cambridge and Trumpington. • Site assessed previously and rejected, nothing has changed since then to alter that conclusion. • Impact on Grantchester Meadows, important green lung for residents and visitors. Part of the setting to Grantchester, and Grantchester Meadows. • Loss of playing fields should be resisted and is contrary to the NPPF. • The site forms an important part of the river valley wildlife corridor. The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species. • Development would lead to the loss of high quality agricultural land. • Additional road junctions required by development would damage appearance of tree lined approach to City. • The trees along Trumpington Road form part of a Woodland Wildlife Site. • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Trumpington Road could not cope with the additional traffic generated by the development. • Inadequate water supply to support development. • Could increase flood risk downstream. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Quarter to Six Quadrant should be preserved and enhanced. <p>4. Land West of Hauxton Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are exceptional circumstances. • Would be a sustainable development with outdoor sports pitches, extension to Trumpington Meadows Country park, a community stadium and indoor sports provision. • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages. M11 forms a natural southern boundary. • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge. • Land already compromised by development. • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable. • Good access. • Minimal landscape impact.
--	---

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development. Allow new development to be completed and settled before more is contemplated. • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge. Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city. • Development would conflict with the aim of having a "quality edge" on the southern approach to Cambridge. Community Stadium not appropriate in this sensitive gateway location. • Highly visible site on rising ground. • Coalescence with Hauxton / Harston. • Development would adversely impact on the setting of the adjacent new country park, including Byrons Pool and the river. • Loss of landscaped foreground to the new city edge needed to form a positive southern boundary to the city and buffer this area from the motorway. Noise and air quality concerns as close to M11. • Would erode the amenity value of the Trumpington Meadows country park. • Inadequate water supply to support development. • Could increase flood risk downstream. • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity. • Noise from the stadium. • Impact on local services and amenities including schools (primary school at Trumpington Meadows incapable of extension). • New retail should be in city centre. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor development acceptable. • Should include the WWTW at Bayer Cropscience. • The Quarter to Six Quadrant should be preserved and enhanced. <p>5. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages. M11 forms a natural southern boundary. • Would provide office/research and employment development (science park), 1,250 dwellings, local shops and community facilities, a primary school, public open space, strategic
--	--

	<p>landscaping, highways and other supporting infrastructure in a sustainable location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge and would assist the delivery of high levels of employment growth in Cambridge. • Good transport network nearby. • Site is available and can be delivered in plan period. • Land already compromised by development, would not harm Green Belt purposes. • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable. • Would allow for enhancement of nearby habitats and increased access to the countryside. • Provided views maintained and clear separation between development and Great Shelford. • Potential for major growth which has little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development. • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. • Allow new development to be completed and settled before more is contemplated, area is already overdeveloped. • Planning inspectors have ruled Addenbrooke's Road is a sensible Green Belt boundary. • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge. Would compromise planned Green Belt edge on Glebe Road. Harmful impact on views of Cambridge from the Gogs. • Development south of Glebe Road rejected in earlier plans and nothing has changed since then. • Would lead to ribbon development and coalescence with Great Shelford. • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, local school places, services and facilities. • Would worsen traffic and slow ambulances going to Addenbrooke's Hospital. • Noise and air quality concerns as close to M11. • Loss of amenity, open spaces and land for walking. • Could increase flood risk downstream. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not as intrusive as other options. • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable. • The southern limit of this site would need to be defined with
--	---

	<p>care. If extended too far to the south it could swamp Great Shelford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the better of the options, as it continues on from existing developments. However, it could cause congestion and the transport infrastructure would need to be improved to cope. <p>6. Land South of Addenbrooke’s Road between Babraham Road and Shelford Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages. • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge including affordable homes, and would deliver new infrastructure to help serve existing uses. • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable. • Provided views maintained and clear separation between development and Great Shelford. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development. • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge. Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city. Harmful to views from the Gogs and Wandlebury. • Would lead to coalescence with Great Shelford. • No development south of the Addenbrooke’s Access Road which is a clear Green belt boundary. Undermine the new planned edge for the city. • Would lead to ribbon development distant from existing communities and would create an isolated new community. • Used for recreation, important to preserve the unspoiled view of White Hill. • Development should not encroach upon Nine Wells and to the land on either side of Granhams Road, which has landscape value. • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, and local school places, services and facilities. • Would worsen traffic and slow ambulances going to Addenbrooke’s Hospital. • Could constrain long term growth of the Biomedical Campus. • Damage to biodiversity and Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve.
--	---

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not as intrusive as other options. • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable. • Area between Shelford Road and Babraham Road is of high value landscape. Some small areas to the rear of Shelford Road could be developed with a tree belt edge continuing the boundary of the Clay Farm 'green wedge. <p>7. Land between Babraham Road and Fulbourn Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages. • Could help meet housing and employment development needs of Cambridge. • Deliverable in plan period. • Could provide for up to 4,000 new homes in a sustainable location close to the jobs at the Addenbrooke's Hospital, Marshalls and ARM. • Would allow for expansion of Peterhouse Technology Park. • Can provide significant open space and recreation areas. • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable, could minimise the starkness of Addenbrooke's and low lying land development would have less impact. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development. • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city. New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge. • Majority of land is elevated with important views - development could not easily be screened from other vantage points. High landscape value. Harmful to views from the Gogs and Wandlebury. • Worts Causeway and minor road over hill towards Fulbourn provide a well-used route for leisure access to countryside and development along this corridor would have a significant negative impact. • Harmful to setting and character of Fulbourn. • Contrary to the conclusions of earlier Green Belt studies and to those of the Inspector when considering proposals for housing at Netherhall Farm in 2006. • Important for amenity and recreation. Impact on tranquillity of
--	--

	<p>the countryside. Damage to biodiversity and Nature Reserves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on traffic. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable if the done with sensitivity to preserve the best of the landscape. Land either side of Worts Causeway would seem to be most unobtrusive. <p>8. Land East of Gazelle Way (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge. • Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers. • Strong possibility provided a clear (green) corridor retained for Teversham village. • Would not involve views of the historic city. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development. • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city. Loss of rolling countryside with good views of Cambridge. Adverse impact on concept of a compact city. • Would reduce the separation of Fulbourn from Cambridge which is already compromised by the Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospital sites, and Tesco, making retention of open land to the north more important. • Would turn Teversham into a suburb of Cambridge and destroy the character of the village. • Impacts of road network, local roads already congested. Inadequate public transport to support development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers. • Minimal impact on the setting of the city and good transport links. Least worse of the options. • Merging with Fulbourn should be avoided, however Teversham could be expanded north and eastwards considerably: there is little landscape value in that area.
--	--

9. Land at Fen Ditton (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

- Sustainable location to provide much needed homes and/or employment for the Cambridge area.
- Could provide a foot/cycle bridge over the river Cam to link to the Science Park and the new rail station.
- Development would retain a strategic green edge along A14, thereby preserving openness of immediate area and wider landscaped setting of Cambridge.
- Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers.

OBJECTIONS:

- No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development.
- No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.
- Fen Ditton is a historic settlement, most of which has been designated a Conservation Area. Additional development of any size in this area would subsume Fen Ditton into the city.
- Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city and of maintaining rural setting of Fen Ditton.
- Importance of Green Belt has been examined through Local Development Framework and through various planning applications, which have dismissed development as inappropriate.
- The infrastructure could not support any further development.
- Would lead to urban sprawl, Cambridge could accommodate more by building taller.
- Unsustainable location, limited bus services, negative impact on road network which is one of the most congested in the city, there is no village shop, the sewage system is overburdened and inadequate, and the B1047 already carries a heavy vehicular load.
- Commons on the river corridor are essential open space for the city.
- Noise from the A14.
- Open and rural nature of land between Chesterton and Fen Ditton is highly prized and has been identified by local and city people as essential open space.

COMMENTS:

- Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers.
- Development might be possible if Fen Ditton village can be

	<p>adequately protected and significant improvements are made to the transport system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There must be a 'buffer zone' between development and the edge of the River to preserve rural character of the Green Corridor. <p>10. Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable location for housing and employment development including strategic open space. Transport, noise and air quality issues can be mitigated. • Best of the locations as least effect on the landscape, therefore well landscaped sensitive development acceptable. Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers. • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge. • This land is not easily accessed for recreation and too close to the A14 to be really worth keeping as Green Belt. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development. • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. • Development would have negative impacts on Girton. This land forms a buffer between the village of Girton and the City, without it Girton could be subsumed as a suburb to the city. • Close to A14 so will not be a pleasant place to live. • Flood risk downstream, site could be used for a reservoir to serve the North-West developments. • NIAB and NIAB2 have failed to provide strategic green infrastructure and allocation of this area for development would only compound the short-sighted decisions of the Councils regarding this area. • Loss of green corridor for wildlife. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers. • This should be kept mostly as open space with some low density development.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Both Councils took a joined up approach in the issues and options consultations in Summer 2012 and asked whether land should be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, and if so, where this should be. Ten broad locations around the edge of Cambridge were consulted on.</p>

	<p>To help inform the process moving forward, the Councils have since undertaken a joint review of the inner Green Belt boundary. The purpose of the review was to provide an up to date evidence base and to help the Councils reach a view on whether there are specific areas of land that could be considered for release from the Green Belt and allocated for development to meet their identified needs without significant harm to Green Belt purposes. The update found that most of the inner Green Belt continues to be of high importance for Green Belt purposes and specifically important to protect the setting and special character of Cambridge as a compact historic city. The adjacent areas to the previous releases have also gained a greater value. The Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012 therefore found that there were a limited number of small sites which are of lesser importance to Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>A technical assessment of a range of sites on the edge of Cambridge has been undertaken. Each assessment considered a wide range of constraints, policy designations and matters important to sustainability and had regard to the comments submitted on the ten broad locations. The full technical assessments are included in Site Assessments for Edge of Cambridge Sites 2012 (which is reproduced in Annex 2).</p> <p>Six sites on the edge of Cambridge were considered to have potential for housing or employment development. The remaining sites assessed have been rejected due to either their significance to the Green Belt purposes and / or for other factors including planning constraints. A summary of the comments received on the six site options and the rejected sites is included in Appendix 4 (Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge: Summary of Representations and Response to Key Issues). This appendix includes the Council's response and conclusion on each of the sites.</p> <p>The Council has sought to identify sustainable sites, in the best locations to provide housing to meet its objectively assessed need. The sites are identified in the draft Local Plan and on the Policies Map. The preferred approach includes one site on the edge of Cambridge for housing. NIAB3 (site option GB6 consulted on in Issues & Options 2: Part 1) will be included in the draft Local Plan to enable the delivery of 1,000 homes on the combined NIAB2 and NIAB3 sites, which is 100 homes less than had previously been planned for the NIAB2 site alone.</p> <p>Include land adjoining Peterhouse Technology Park (Fulbourn Road East, site option GB5 consulted on in Issues & Options 2: Part 1) as an employment allocation in the draft Local Plan. The</p>
--	--

	<p>site is suitable for employment development and has the potential to respond to issues arising in the Employment Land Review, that there is demand for additional employment land on the edge of Cambridge. Proposals will need to demonstrate how the site can be designed and landscaped to effectively mitigate impact on the wider Cambridge Green Belt and will need to include the creation of landscaped buffers to ensure that the development cannot be seen from higher ground to the south.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031
<p>Policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031 (and Paragraphs 2.42 to 2.46 and Figure 1 Key Diagram for South Cambridgeshire and Figure 2 Key Diagram for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire)</p>	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 362 Support: 230 Object: 132</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council - broadly supportive of the spatial strategy • Cambridgeshire County Council - supports the employment related allocations on the edge of Cambridge and the new settlement proposals • North Hertfordshire District Council – support as majority of development located away from south of district. • Barrington Parish Council – Support for rejection of land at Barrington Quarry. • Ickleton Parish Council, Harlton Parish Council, Barton Parish Council, Whittlesford Parish Council, Papworth Parish Council – Support development strategy. • Elsworth Parish Council – Support rejection of North Cambourne proposal. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Support focus on new settlements. • Support for retention of the development sequence. • Support decision to rule out further large scale developments in the Green Belt, which would be harmful to Cambridge. • New housing on edge of Cambridge is essential for public transport and cycling. • Support housing in a few new settlements rather than many rural locations. Smaller villages do not have infrastructure to serve growth. New settlements offer opportunity to deliver sustainable infrastructure.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn airfield is an underused brownfield site. • Waterbeach is well placed for further development. • Support rejection of site north of A428 Cambourne (156 representations) • Support rejection of Hanley Grange. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrington Parish Council – Plan does not support sustainability. Should cap scale of development at villages, do more to protect services and improve transport to villages. • Bourn Parish Council - Fundamental problem with development strategy, it fails to align employment areas with housing areas. Has not considered potential of sustainable villages, so they can improve their local services. SHLAA took a passive role. • Cambourne Parish Council, Caldecote Parish Council – Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West are unviable. • Great Abington Parish Council – Unhappy at the focus on new communities, leaves Abingtons with no growth. • Great Shelford Parish Council – Putting edge of Cambridge at the top of development sequence could add to pressure for Green Belt development. • Horningsea Parish Council – Indirect impact from Waterbeach new town, including from traffic. • Madingley Parish Council – A1303 already over capacity. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Policy should state brownfield land first. • Teversham Parish Council - opposes the decision to carry forward the Cambridge East Area Action Plan and safeguard airport. • Environment Agency – general support but need to fully resolve issues regarding wastewater treatment at Cambourne west. • Wildlife Trust - further formal assessment of the Waterbeach New Town site is required to prove that this scale of development is achievable while still being able to retain significant areas for biodiversity. The Key Diagram has omitted to show some important ecological networks. • Middle Level Commissioners – Concerned at extra flows to Uttons Drove waste water treatment works. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question the need for the level of development. • Will lead to urban sprawl with Cambridge merging with surrounding villages. • Large scale of development already planned at Northstowe. • Policy should include requirement to prioritise previously
--	--

	<p>developed land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites identified until 2050, beyond the remit of the plan. • Remove Bourn Airfield / west Cambourne: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Insufficient road capacity on A428 corridor. Madingley Road upgrade inadequate. ○ Consider new guided busway. ○ Traffic in Cambourne and surrounding villages. ○ Impact on villages in A1198 corridor. ○ The area is overdeveloped / spread development elsewhere. ○ No funding available for infrastructure. ○ Expensive public transport. ○ Small housing developments in the countryside instead ○ Develop on edge of Cambridge instead. ○ People moved to Cambourne to be in a village. ○ Urban sprawl and loss of village character. ○ Lack of local employment. Employment land in employment allocated for housing. ○ A strip of new Green Belt is required to separate Bourn Airfield from Cambourne. ○ Bourn Airfield will end up as a satellite to Cambourne, reliant on its services. ○ Failed to consider development near southern employment areas. ○ SCDC has not sought to proactively identify and help bring forward any potentially more suitable and sustainable sites. • Remove Waterbeach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transport impacts, particularly on A10. ○ Flood Risk ○ focus development on the barracks site and complete earlier in the plan period. • Bourn Airfield should not be held back unfairly and 5 years later than Cambourne West. • Waterbeach new town should be moved forward in the trajectory. • Cumulative delivery impact as all three new settlements are north of Cambridge. • Policy should differentiate between new town and new villages, as new villages only as sustainable as Rural Centres. • Over reliance on a few large sites will lead to under delivery, particularly due to level of infrastructure required. • Insufficient regard has been given to the potential for further development on the edge of Cambridge due to
--	---

	<p>greater weight being given to the protection of the Green Belt than wider sustainability considerations, in particular transport related.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should continue Structure Plan development sequence. Strategy reverts back to dispersal. • Maintaining Cambridge as a compact city is unjustified as Cambridge has an important role in the UK economy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petition of 2,242 signatures calling for withdrawal of sites in the Green Belt. • Edge of Cambridge Green Belt should be last resort rather than top of sequence. • Exceptional circumstances for Green Belt review has not been demonstrated. • Green Belt sites should be developed last, if they are needed at all. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should have considered role of market towns around for meeting housing needs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be more development at villages to meet local housing needs and utilise and support existing infrastructure. • Villages should be allowed to choose to have additional growth. • Planning no development will harm group and infill villages, making them homes for only richer people. • Scale of restrictions on village development not flexible to allow development opportunities on Previously Developed Land to be taken. • Should support growth of villages along the Guided Busway. • Policy should state that building in villages will only happen if demand for new homes cannot be met through development on edge of Cambridge and new settlement sites. <p>Non- Edge of Cambridge proposals for new / alternative strategic sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NORTHSTOWE - Land north and east of Northstowe. (SHLAA Site 274) • LAND NORTH OF CAMBOURNE, Land north of A428, Cambourne (SHLAA Sites 194 & 265) • LAND AT CAMBOURNE WEST (extend closer to Caxton Gibbet) <p>(Proposals for Strategic development on edge of Cambridge listed under S/4).</p>
--	---

<p>Assessment</p>	<p>There is significant support for the development strategy policy, including from Cambridge City and Cambridgeshire County Councils and a number of parish councils.</p> <p>Objections are made by a number of parish councils for a range of reasons, including those that do not support development proposals in their areas to those that are concerned that they may get pressures for more development than the plan shows and one parish council wanting more development locally to respond to its own needs. Issues raised on water impacts of the plan and ecology at Waterbeach new town proposal are dealt with elsewhere to separate representations.</p> <p>Representations on specific locations fall into three groups: those that wish to see one or more of the new strategic proposals at Waterbeach new town, Bourn Airfield new village or Cambourne West village extension deleted from the plan; those that propose large scale development on the edge of Cambridge through Green Belt release; and those objecting to any release of land from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge or at larger villages within the Green Belt. A large number of representations are registered against those specific policies, in particular Bourn Airfield (1,817), and there is a petition against any Green Belt releases with a very large number of signatures (2,242). The specific issues raised on the strategic sites in the plan are addressed in Chapter 3 and the phasing of those sites at Policy S/12. The Green Belt issues are addressed at Policy S/4.</p> <p>There has been close joint working with the City Council, including on the development strategy and the appropriate approach to the focus of development. This included coordination of issues raised in the Councils' first Issues and Options consultations and a joint Part 1 document in the Issues and Options 2 consultation. These were supported by joint evidence documents. A review of the development strategy supports both Local Plans. It tests the sequence for development and explains why the edge of Cambridge remains the most sustainable location for development in terms of access to services and facilities. The Issues and Options 2 Joint Part 1 consultation specifically asked what the appropriate balance is between the locational merits of the edge of Cambridge and the importance of protecting the Green Belt setting of Cambridge as an important historic city.</p> <p>The transport implications of the different strategy options were tested through transport modelling during the evolution of the development strategy in the Cambridge Sub Regional Transport Modelling Report for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans (2013). This informed the preparation of the development</p>
--------------------------	---

	<p>strategy. The sustainability appraisal undertaken jointly by the two Councils informed the conclusion that the accessibility benefits of edge of Cambridge locations do not to override the Green Belt importance of the majority of the edge of Cambridge sites, and that new settlements will enable significant transport improvements to be focused on two corridors to deliver high quality public transport and create sustainable developments. The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was prepared alongside the Local Plan process and appropriately reflects the development strategy included in the two Local Plans.</p> <p>The joint Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012 identified a small number of areas that could be released from the Green Belt without fundamental harm to its purposes and these areas are proposed to be allocated for development (see Policy S/4). There is a high level of housing need in South Cambridgeshire reflecting the success of the local economy. This requirement must be balanced with the green belt around Cambridge that exists to protect the character and setting of the world famous historic city, the fact that South Cambridgeshire currently has no towns within its area, and the rural nature of South Cambridgeshire as a whole. In view of these challenges, it would be unrealistic to expect to prepare a plan where there is complete consensus.</p> <p>The proposed development strategy carries forward the emphasis on Cambridge-focused development contained in the Structure Plan 2003, with similar proportion of development in and on the edge of Cambridge, but it has a greater proportion of new development in new settlements and less in villages. This represents a sustainable development strategy for the wider Cambridge area that meets objectively assessed housing needs in a way that supports the successful economy and provides pattern of development that will give genuine opportunities for residents of new developments to live in a sustainable way. Many will benefit from new settlements that provide a wide range of services and facilities and, with significant new public transport measures on the two corridors involved akin to the successful Guided Busway, the opportunity to move around the area by sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>The strategy has a focus on major developments that create the opportunity for high quality local service provision, but in order to provide a robust and flexible strategy with a variety in the type and size of housing sites, it also provides a number of village housing and employment sites that are located in the larger and better served villages and can help keep maintain a vibrant rural area. The plan also defines village categories based on the level of</p>
--	--

	<p>services and facilities available to local residents and polices to enable some development to come forward commensurate with their local character and to meet local needs.</p> <p>For main issues and assessment of strategic objection sites see Annex A.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Localism and Relationship with Neighbourhood Development Plans

Note: This issue was consulted upon in 2012 and resulted in a number of Parish Council led proposals being included within subsequent consultations and within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. These matters are included within the audit trail for the resulting policies:

Policy S/7: Development Frameworks (Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy)

Policy NH/12: Local Green Space (Chapter 6: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment)

Policy H/1: Allocations for Residential Development at Villages (Chapter 7: High Quality Homes)

Policy E/8: Mixed-use development in Histon & Impington Station Area (Chapter 8: Building a Strong and Competitive Economy)

Policy SC/1: Allocations for Open Space (Chapter 9: Promoting Successful Communities)

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 7	Localism and Relationship with Neighbourhood Development Plans
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Planning Policy Framework 2012 • Localism Act 2011
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision, Values and The Three As - South Cambridgeshire District Council (2012) • South Cambridgeshire Statement of Community Involvement (2010)
Analysis	<p>The Localism Act 2011 creates new responsibilities and opportunities for local communities to be actively involved in planning. The District Council wishes to engage positively with local communities in the preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and that local planning authorities should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see. To support this, local planning authorities should aim to involve all sections of the community in the development of Local Plans and in planning decisions, and should facilitate neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>The NPPF provides a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities. Neighbourhood Plans have to be consistent with the strategic policies in the current Local Development Framework and, when adopted, the new Local Plan. Neighbourhood Development Plans are optional but Parishes can use them to make their own development proposals if they wish. It is intended that the new Local Plan will be closely aligned with local opinion and will be supported so that time and resources are</p>

	<p>not required to develop separate neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The Council will engage with Parish Councils during the Issues and Options consultation to explore ways of meeting local aspirations through the new Local Plan and heard from interested local communities how they thought this could best be achieved.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 7: Do you think local aspirations can be reflected in the Local Plan?</p> <p>If yes, how can this best be done? If no, why do you take that view?</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>A further step towards encouraging community involvement in planning, has potential to support achievement of the community involvement objective.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Support: 58; Object: 8; Comment: 61</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Parish Councils (responses from 30 Parish Councils)</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to be dialogue with Parish councils.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should reflect local aspirations. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not possible to reflect local aspirations in the Local Plan as it is too generic. • Many people don't engage with district plans. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDC should help those who want to develop Neighbourhood Plans. • Local Plan must be flexible to village needs. • Not enough time for villages to engage effectively. • A number of Parishes want improved facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gamlingay and Hauxton – Burial space needed. - Graveley Parish Council – would like to consider land for additional development. - Great Shelford Parish Council – need recreation space. - Milton – Need recreation space. <p>Other respondents</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, by appropriate consultation and effective engagement with local people. • Local aspirations should be taken into account, preferably without parishes having to produce a costly and cumbersome neighbourhood plan. • Local aspirations must be taken into account but they must be balanced against the need to continue to help the sub-region's economy to prosper. • The primacy of planning decisions should lie with the Local Plan, to stop the fragmentation of planning decisions. • Be more flexible on development in smaller villages. • Use Parish Plans to establish local opinion. • Incorporate specific guidance for each village. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local aspirations and views of the community should not be reflected in the Local Plan if they prevent the Council from delivering its objectively assessed needs for homes and jobs. • Need more effective ways to engage. • Should devolve more to Parish level. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do more to support village services and facilities. • Need to ensure comments gathered at local level are representative.
Preferred Approach and	A number of proposals were submitted by Parish Councils to the Council during the Issues & Options consultation in Summer

<p>Reasons</p>	<p>2012. Where they were consistent with the approach being taken in the Local Plan, they were included in the Issues & Options 2 Report for consultation. However, a number of proposals were not consistent with this approach, but they were considered to be proposals that would be capable of being included in a Neighbourhood Plan as they would meet the test of being in conformity with the strategic policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Parish Council proposals included in the Issues & Options 2: Part 2 consultation document that were not consistent with the Local Plan approach were labelled 'PC', and consisted of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC1: regeneration proposal for 'Station' in Histon & Impington. • PC2: proposal to reinvigorate Cottenham through a development of homes, jobs, shops, schools, community uses and possibly a bypass. • PC3-PC13: proposed changes to village frameworks in Comberton, Little Gransden, Toft and Whaddon. • PC14-PC23: proposed Local Green Spaces in Bassingbourn, Foxton, Gamlingay, Great Shelford, Haslingfield, Milton, Papworth Everard, Steeple Morden and Toft. • PC24-PC30: proposed Important Countryside Frontages in Cambourne, Gamlingay, Great Shelford and Over. <p>Issues & Options 2: Part 2 consultation document also asked in Issue 10 whether there was suitable land available in Gamlingay or Hauxton that could provide burial ground facilities for these villages, as both Parish Councils had identified a need in their villages.</p> <p>The Council's preferred approach is set out in the individual audit trails for each of these proposals. A summary is provided here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC1 (Histon & Impington): this proposal is consistent with the Local Plan, and appears to have strong local support. • PC2 (Cottenham): this proposal is not consistent with the Local Plan, and from the consultation responses does not appear to have an overall majority of local support. • Village Frameworks: one change (PC3) is being taken forward as it reflects local support for minor amendments to provide greater flexibility and to take account of local circumstances. A proposed change to Hillside at Orwell proposed by the Parish Council through Issues & Options 2 is also being taken forward as it is consistent with the Council's approach. • Local Green Spaces: the Council's response to each of the Parish Council proposed Local Green Spaces that were subject to public consultation in Issues & Options 2, and also the new Local Green Spaces proposed by Parish Councils
-----------------------	---

	<p>through that consultation, are set out in Appendix 5 (Evidence Paper for Local Green Spaces and Protected Village Amenity Areas).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important Countryside Frontages: the Council's response to each of the Parish Council proposed Important Countryside Frontages that were subject to public consultation in Issues & Options 2, and also the new Important Countryside Frontages proposed by Parish Councils through that consultation, are set out in Appendix 6 (Evidence Paper for Important Countryside Frontages). • Provision of Burial Grounds: no specific allocations are included in the local plan. A site has been found and obtained by Gamlingay Parish Council. The site suggested by Hauxton Parish Council is identified as informal open space, it is also not ideally located, given the lack of road access, and therefore it is not considered suitable for allocation. The Council will continue to work with the Parish Council to support their search for a suitable site. <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graveley Parish Council has decided to pursue their wish for land to be considered for additional development through a neighbourhood plan. • Great Shelford Parish Council identified a need for recreation space. Two sites for open space in Great Shelford were included in the Issues & Options 2: Part 2 consultation and are being included as allocations in the draft Local Plan. • A need for recreation space in Milton was identified. A site in Milton was included in the Issues & Options 2: Part 2 consultation and is being included as an allocation in the draft Local Plan.
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy E/8: Mixed-use development in Histon & Impington Station area Policy SC/1: Allocations for Open Space Policy S/7: Development Frameworks (village led changes) Policy NH/12: Local Green Space Policy H/1: Allocations for Residential Development at Villages.</p>

Development to Fund a Bypass in Cottenham

Note: No policy included in Proposed Submission Local Plan

Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2) Issue 5	Development to Fund a Bypass in Cottenham
Key evidence	
Existing policies	None
Analysis	<p>The Council received a proposal from Cottenham Parish Council as part of the proposal that the Local Plan includes community initiatives that local parish councils would otherwise have wished to put in a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Cottenham Parish Council would like to promote a project designed to reinvigorate the village by delivering new employment, potentially around 1,500 homes, schools, local shops, recreation open space and other supporting uses necessary to restore Cottenham's status as a Rural Centre. The Parish Council suggests this development could include the provision of a bypass and this would be funded through the development.</p> <p>The Parish Council will use the consultation to gauge public support and to develop its proposals. Note – the Parish Council also consulted on three slightly amended proposals with varying amounts of housing. The consultation results will help the Parish Council decide whether to ask the District Council to include the scheme in the Local Plan or whether to undertake a neighbourhood plan.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and</p>

	train.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 5: Do you support or object to the development proposed by Cottenham Parish Council, that are geared to provide jobs, satisfy affordable housing needs, provide recreational and shopping facilities, and fund bypass, and if so, why?</p> <p>Please provide comments.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Cottenham Parish Council has proposed a significant scale of development on the east side of the village, in order to deliver a by-pass for the village High Street. The proposal is at an early stage of development, and they are using the consultation to gather views on its potential. An initial assessment has been carried of the proposal. There are significant benefits of providing a bypass to the village, and potential benefits to social and economic objectives through additional services, facilities and employment, but the necessary enabling development would have a number of negative environmental impacts on the local environment.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Support: 123, Object: 569, Comment: 502 Representations: 1,194</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Questionnaire Question 1: Do you agree that the Plan for Cottenham should be based upon the need for a) Jobs, b) Affordable Housing, c) Shops and Offices?</p> <p>a) Jobs (Yes: 41, No: 102)</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misguided to assume availability of new industrial units and offices will produce new businesses and jobs and those jobs will be filled by people living within walking or cycling distance. Already many units of varying sizes in local area sitting empty, some for considerable time, where they have additional benefit of better transport links, most notable Cambridge Research Park and Glenmore Business Park on A10 north of Waterbeach. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you surveyed Broad Lane industrial site to establish what percentage of local people are employed? • Not primarily. No serious issue of unemployment in Cottenham. If Parish Council wants to improve employment prospects, its energies would be better spent on campaigning for improved public transport. • Live so close to Cambridge that employment issue are minimal. I wouldn't want to stay and work where I grew up. Most young people will go to city. <p>b) Affordable Housing (Yes: 87, No: 70)</p>

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include some additional affordable housing, but find it hard to believe that local need is as outlined. Affordable housing should be built close to village amenities and public transport routes. • Need for affordable housing could be achieved with an additional 500 or so houses. • Only provide for village (Northstowe should provide for wider area) • How does it stay affordable? • What is meant by affordable? This is relative to local house prices, and still way beyond many young people. Should include social housing and part-ownership for young people. • All 3 schemes are too committed, e.g. option 1 - 500 homes with 40% - 200 affordable is excessive. <p>c) Shops and Offices (Yes: 47, No: 85)</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's a village not a commercial centre. We don't want a town! <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenahm particularly well served with variety of shops and services. • No – Tesco Bar Hill and Milton, few if any shops would survive and office premises usually stay vacant a long time. • Currently empty shop and office space in Cottenham. <p>Questionnaire Question 2: Do you agree that the Plan should be looking to create a) a new village centre b) another industrial area?</p> <p>a) Yes: 16, No: 164, Possibly: 4</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good co-op, butchers, green grocers and now an excellent community centre. Improve on existing area do not divide the village with one elsewhere. • Village already has a centre which has developed historically and forms an intrinsic part of village's character, readily accessible to majority of residents. New centre would necessarily detract from this and possibly lead to its partial destruction. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for new health centre but this should be accommodated within heart of existing village. One possibility might be for Durman Stearn to move to a new industrial site and their existing site be re-developed as health centre.
--	--

b) Yes: 19, No: 141, Possibly: 17

OBJECTIONS:

- No demonstrable need for the industrial area. Already vacant commercial premises in village and many more within local area.
- Current centre is excellent and well used, whilst industrial area, in contrast, feels run-down and in need of modernisation - but not necessarily expansion.
- Need to strengthen existing industrial estates - achieve quicker results and send signal that Cottenham keen to be promoted as business centre.
- Businesses are better located at present, interspersed within existing village. No guarantee that firms will move to new industrial area, and if they do, no guarantee they will be staffed by village residents.
- Create further employment sites but not another industrial estate per se. Currently maybe five industrial estates in village, small scale industries might be better integrated than one large estate, and certainly not one at wrong end of village which would potentially make traffic through village worse and require good number of villagers to drive to it.

COMMENTS:

- Need for small to mid-scale commercial units. Like idea for start-up units linked to education and training. Not in estate but spread through village like existing businesses. Large estate does not mean large numbers of employees so less job creation.
- Another industrial area is best located along Beach Road, enabling access to A10 without travelling through village.
- If new area is created would existing industrial sites be moved from Millfield and Broad Lane?
- 'Vision Park' experiment in Histon - few local jobs resulted, empty premises and some loss of village community.

Questionnaire Question 3: Do you agree that a By-pass would be a satisfactory solution to the various traffic problems?

Yes: 24, No: 149

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

- If we do not get a by-pass Cottenham traffic will become intolerable. Northstowe residents will cut through to A10 and new development around Waterbeach. Waterbeach residents will cut through to A14/M11, as doubt A14/M11 junction will be modified.

OBJECTIONS:

Address source of problem

- Need cohesive traffic management plan for area as whole, focusing

	<p>on A10 to reduce 'rat running'. Transport links should look wider/further to incorporate new developments. Invest in cycle ways and pedestrian routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A14 and A10 are in much need for upgrade. No monies for these routes, so no funds for a by-pass. Not needed or necessary. • A14 and A10 should be bypass for Histon & Impington, Cottenham and surrounding villages. Any road linking A14 through Northstowe, Cottenham, A10 to Waterbeach would act to reduce congestion on A14 to detriment of all local villages. (3) <p><u>Bypass doesn't address problem</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B1049 - Proposal will create more traffic problems for Histon at village green - already at breaking point and bottle necks at Histon and Haddenham cannot cope. (2) • Make traffic worse somewhere else, either in another village or in different part of our own village. Coupled with known effects on village centres elsewhere these are only really a solution to crippling traffic problems where no other issues will arise from loss of through traffic. • Option 2 is a by-pass through a village. Commuters won't stomach 6 roundabouts for long and will come through village. If they don't shops will close. • By-pass would not stop lorries going to Broad Lane. <p><u>Shifts focus of village</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even if bypass was practical and desirable, proposal not only shifts focus of village away from historic centre, but divides proposed new housing development, with new park and recreation ground on opposite side of bypass to majority of village. <p><u>Alternatives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No real traffic issues in Cottenham. • Improvement to High Street Cottenham to reduce speed and reduce through traffic (rat run) for A10 could easily be carried out. (2) • To solve traffic issues have village as a 20mph zone, not just Lambs Lane at school times. • Better public transport, links to guided busway, (parking at Oakington or Histon stops) and cycle paths that connect into village would be better use of money to reduce traffic. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current traffic problems are rooted in speed rather than quantity. Main speeding areas of my concern are the Rampton Road, Lambs Lane and 'CO-OP' corner of High Street. Entrance / exit of the CO-OP would benefit from signage and parking restrictions to aid viewing also. • Could only be funded by something like scale of growth proposed in option 3. Lead to disastrous increase in traffic both in Cottenham and neighbouring villages, and change village to town. • Improved enforcement of current car parking would help -
--	--

	<p>especially round the CO-OP. Don't have very many lorries going through village - no problems on my bicycle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to slow traffic and enforce no lorry route (lorries use B1049 instead of A10). • Busiest routes are Rampton Road/Twenty Pence Road/ Histon Road. By-pass needs to provide direct link from Rampton Road to Twenty Pence Road. Proposed route risks not being used by this traffic (including future Longstowe traffic). • Suggest by-pass coming off B1049 North of Cottenham to link A10 North of Waterbeach and improvements of A10 into Cambridge. Consider linking into new railway station at Chesterton. <p>Questionnaire Question 4: Do you agree that the provision for perhaps as many as 4500 new houses is a price that should be paid to provide jobs, social housing and full amenity for the village?</p> <p>Yes: 10, No: 175</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reluctantly Yes. Do not think an increase of only 1,500 will generate enough resources to improve infrastructure and amenities to a satisfactory level. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For majority of villagers, these proposals would almost certainly lead to some loss of community, amenity and quality of life. This number of houses would ruin the village character and split the village in two. • Options 2 and 3 are ludicrous in their assumptions. • No evidence that more houses will create more business for shops or jobs. In fact over the last 20 years the reverse has happened. • Reality - people can, do and will work outside of village - no amount of development is going to rectify this fact. Increase in house numbers is likely to make matter worse rather than better. People want to work in Cambridge, not Cottenham. • Better to improve transport links by increasing cyclepath networks and providing faster commuting bus into city to serve existing residents than build a larger village. Northstowe and large development proposed at Waterbeach are nearby and we should be aiming to take advantage of our proximity to these as well as to Cambridge. • Increased risk of flooding and underground water drainage system to Cottenham cannot cope. • We submitted site 113 which could have been used 100% for affordable housing it adjoins site 260 & 003 and was declined because it was too large!! Now suddenly we want 4500 houses!
--	---

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4500? The amount is very questionable. • Any expansion should be gradual and organic. • Existing infrastructure ok for current village population, though school already needs more capacity. <p>Questionnaire Question 5: Which option do you support if any?</p> <p>Option A: Yes: 71, No 19 Option B: Yes: 19, No 42 Option C: Yes: 13, No 44 Option D: 66 (Limited development / infill: 55, other 11) Option E: Yes: 64, No 5</p> <p>Option A</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPC support this option as alternative to SCDC SHLAA proposal. Critical to this option is expansion of primary school, provision of a fuel station and store. • Option 1 is about the ideal max growth for Cottenham. • If any I would pick option 1, minimal disruption to the village. • Primary school would need enlarging and increased traffic calming in the village. • Fields surrounding Mill Field and Long Drove frequently flood. • Sensible because it places most new housing in a location which gives access to guided bus and A14 without need to travel through village. • Areas west / south west of village preferable. Development to north should be disregarded. <p>Option B</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the duration of the plan to 2031, CPC continues to support its plan as illustrated by option 2. • 1,500 sounds a lot but will be over quite a long time span so a gradual increase should be manageable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase size of this village to that of Bar Hill is totally unnecessary with Northstowe, and possibly Waterbeach going ahead / under consideration. • No guarantees of a bypass or any other amenity being built by developers, plus creation of many new jobs in village is highly debateable. • Scale of development proposed not necessary to restore the status of village to a Rural Centre.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant loss of best agricultural land - most Grade 1 land. • Detached from village. • Significant negative impact on townscape character, intrusion into open countryside. Detrimental impact on Grade 1 church and Conservation Area. • New 'village centre' could lead decline existing shops and services - adversely affect vibrancy and character of Conservation Area. • Options 2 and 3 would see lane bisected by bypass and swamped by new housing estates, and valuable amenity lost. Lane couldn't cope with additional houses and vehicles. Increase in traffic would result in it no longer being viable or safe for walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders, many families with young children. <p>Option C</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option C is best as it has a sensible by-pass. Better to have a bigger project over longer time than one that may not meet need and has to be extended. • Village has grown but infrastructure not kept pace. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of development proposed not necessary to restore the status of village to a Rural Centre. • Potential impact on air quality and by-pass would increase road traffic noise. • Create largest Rural Centre, but only served by 'B' road and generate significant traffic through Histon and onto A14. • Significant loss of best agricultural land - most Grade 1 land. • Detached from village. • Significant negative impact on townscape character, intrusion into open countryside. Detrimental impact on Grade 1 church and Conservation Area. • New 'village centre' could lead decline existing shops and services - adversely affect vibrancy and character of Conservation Area. • Options 2 and 3 would see lane bisected by bypass and swamped by new housing estates, and valuable amenity lost. Lane couldn't cope with additional houses and vehicles. Increase in traffic would result in it no longer being viable or safe for walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders, many families with young children. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Producing an Ely sized town is contrary to any current planning policy / requirement. • Would support if Cottenham becomes a town with the facilities that Ely has with a similar potential population. • Would extend by-pass to Rampton Road as in some early maps.
--	--

Option D OTHER**COMMENTS:**

- Full assessment of housing needs, mixed–use possibilities, schools provision, transport implications, sewerage capacity, electricity network, and other issues needed. Only then could further development be considered.
- Limited housing in keeping with current village character focusing on enhancing current village community. New properties should be interspersed.
- Development (small) should be south or south-west of village to avoid additional through traffic and not more than 50-100 houses.
- Some need for affordable housing - prioritised for those already in village / with immediate family in village and mainstream housing - limited to 350-400 homes maximum, dispersed throughout existing village rather than huge chunks of development which retail a village feel.
- SHLAA preferences offer an acceptable scale of growth.
- District council plan for up to 370 new homes is good.
- Consider housing on site-by-site basis, and integration with existing village / impact on character. Most appropriate locations are 2012 I&O consultation SHLAA sites 003, 123, 124, 129, 234, 260 and 263, site to north of Rampton Road (SHLAA site 128). Parish Council object to preferred SHLAA sites because Green Belt. New bypass through Green Belt would be far worse.
- Particularly object to houses at Rampton fields - would obliterate view from top of cycle track.
- Not Rampton site - huge implications on traffic issues on Rampton Road, better to adopt SCDC proposal to utilise land south of Oakington Road as more integral part of village and does not encroach on arable land, traffic would be able to access via Oakington and Histon Road.

Option E NONE**COMMENTS:**

- SHLAA should only be considered at this stage, if any!
- In their present form the Design Group is unable to support any of the proposals.
- With Northstowe and new town at Waterbeach local development at Cottenham should be limited until road and infrastructure of these developments is assured.
- Your plans have cut our property in half. There should have been consultation with us before you decided to obtain 3 acres of our land.

General Comments

	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate and compatible with localism thinking, but perhaps same aims could be achieved with less upheaval, less expenditure, and in shorter time scale? • Many young people are out of work - if apprenticeships could be a part of new employment opportunities this would be advantageous for young people in the community. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan has not been backed-up with any feasibility studies to show it is viable or would deliver any benefits regarding jobs or affordable housing. • Bypass proposal would have negative impact on natural environment, causing intrusion into open countryside and furthermore land is Grade 1. • Proposals might work for inhabitants of Cottenham but disastrous for Histon and Impington. Even on low (unrealistic) estimates of extra commuter traffic this would swamp capacity of B1049, in particular traffic light crossing at the Green. • Proposals 1 and 2 undermine existing work done in relation to village expansion at local primary school. • Ecology of Cottenham is unique, muntjac, roe deer, grass snakes, lizards, green woodpecker and herons all seen in village. • Strongly oppose "small" development of 50 houses down Church Lane in Option 1. Church Lane and Broad lane are currently only walking routes with access to countryside. Entrance of Church lane would not allow a 2 lane road. Current site of wood yard only partially used and majority is established woodland. • Do not understand why land on Rampton Road (excluded by the Council) is included in all proposals. In third proposal land on Oakington Road is suddenly excluded and Rampton Road still included even though it is out on a limb. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very disappointed the Parish Council decided to reject the South Cambs proposals before consulting residents of the village. • Independent facilitator needed to lead workshops to decide whether Neighbourhood Plan is wanted. If so, how that should be arrived at. Workshop to identify what, where and when development should take place plus design issues. • Serious concerns over implications for historic built environment and legibility of original linear plan-form of the village. • Second Primary School will be divisive. • Public Transport - Why no mention of this in Plan aims? Current service is not sustainable and perpetuates congestion. Need an 'outer ring' that connects to other villages and bus routes. • Support amendments to Green Belt boundary to south east of village, would allow new development closer to village centre than
--	---

	<p>proposed by Parish Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area to north, adjacent to existing industrial estate is isolated from existing village leading to poor integration of new and existing services. Area to east is potentially isolated because likelihood of sufficient connections being available into existing village. On Rampton Road preferred site of Parish Council sits on side of ridge and very visible on approach from Rampton, notwithstanding Les King wood planted just to west. • Concerns about proposal to include large isolated plot of agricultural land to north-east of village Unless can be linked into rest of development and form an integral part, it should be excluded. • Need to consider links with neighbouring villages - new off road cycle routes to Waterbeach, station, Roman Road, Science Park and Business Park. • Need buffer zones to protect existing byways, tracks, bridleways and 'off-road' cycle routes [such as Long Drove and Church Lane]; and significant improvement of footpath network to provide linking and new routes. • Given the location of several existing riding establishments and livery yards north of the village my suggestion would be for the creation of circular bridleway route, to north of village. Provide additional routes for walkers as well as new facilities for horse-riders and cyclists. • Cottenham Lode floods - money from any financial gain should be allocated to old west drainage board to improve The Lodes capacity, Bar Hill, Northstowe - all this drains to Cottenham.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Do not include an allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>This proposal is not consistent with the Local Plan, and from the consultation responses does not appear to have an overall majority of local support.</p> <p>Annex 2 of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal for this proposal in the 'Parish Council Proposals' section.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>No policy.</p>

Policy S/7: Development Frameworks

Note: See audit trail within Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy – Issue 7 Localism and Relationship with Neighbourhood Development Plans relating to proposals from Parish Council

<p>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 15</p> <p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2) Issues 6 & 7</p>	<p>Approach to Village Frameworks</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village Services and Facilities Study: Report 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11
<p>Existing policies</p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DP/7 Development Frameworks • HG/5 Exceptions Sites for Affordable Housing.
<p>Analysis and initial Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Plans for South Cambridgeshire have included village frameworks for many years. They have the advantage of restricting the gradual expansion of villages into the open countryside in an uncontrolled and unplanned way. They also provide certainty to both local communities and the development industry of the Council's approach to development at villages.</p> <p>Many of the villages in South Cambridgeshire offer attractive local living environments based around close knit communities but often have limited services and facilities and poor access to public transport. In terms of policies designed to reduce travel and achieve good levels of access to a range of employment and service opportunities many villages do not score well as locations for development. However, some local communities indicated that they considered that the current policies restrict the potential for their communities to take any new development of even a limited nature. The Council therefore explored the approach to village frameworks through Issues & Options consultation.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>Alternatives were considered to the current village framework approach. Village Frameworks have been in place for a long time and the policy for windfall development on land not allocated in plans means that many possible opportunities have already been developed. The windfall policy is intended to allow small scale development to occur in even the smallest villages. Whilst the evidence is that windfalls continue to come forward because circumstances change over time, the new Plan could take a different approach if it was decided that it should be more flexible and allow some additional development at villages beyond the</p>

	<p>current village framework boundaries.</p> <p>There are different ways this could be done. This is potentially a radical change in approach from previous plans. In view of the new Localism agenda, the Council sought the views of Parish Councils and local residents on whether a greater degree of flexibility is appropriate, or whether the current approach remains the best approach.</p> <p>The new Local Plan could:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Retain village frameworks and the current approach to resisting development outside frameworks as defined on the Proposals Map. ii. Retain village frameworks but include a policy that would allow limited additional development outside and adjoining the frameworks where certain criteria were met. iii. Delete the current village frameworks entirely and instead use a policy that makes clear in words the Council's approach to development on the edge of the built up area of a village. <p>Options (ii) and (iii) could be perceived as a loosening of the Council's approach to development in the countryside on the edge of villages and there is a risk that it could weaken the ability of the Council to resist inappropriate development on the edge of villages. Indeed there seems little point in changing the approach, unless there is a desire to provide more flexibility for more development to come forward on the edge of villages and potentially delivering development that is less sustainable than the current strategy.</p> <p>The question was how much development was being sought, what form it would take, and how overall levels of development could be controlled to avoid sites coming forward all around villages that might be difficult to resist. There is also a significant risk that exception sites for affordable housing may stop coming forward as landowners see a possibility of gaining greater value out of their land.</p> <p>See also the exception sites at Issue 47 which is an alternative approach better targeted to meeting local housing needs as it includes options to allow a limited amount of additional market housing at different levels as part of exception affordable housing sites, and Issue 7 on Localism.</p> <p>The village frameworks are retained in the new Plan, carried</p>
--	---

	forward from the adopted plan, unless any anomalies are identified to the Council that need to be corrected.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Option i. Retain village frameworks - Development frameworks restrict growth on the outer edges of settlements, they therefore perform a role in minimising loss of agricultural land. They protect the character of settlements by preventing gradual expansion of villages, and loss of historic character. They also play a role in restricting the scale of development taking place at villages, particularly smaller ones, which has a positive impact on the sustainable transport objective by focusing development into more accessible locations.</p> <p>Option ii. Retain village frameworks but include policies that allow small scale development adjacent to village frameworks where certain criteria are met - Retaining frameworks but allowing small scale development if certain criteria are met could have a cumulative impact on scale of development in less sustainable villages. Impact of individual developments would to a great extent depend on the criteria, but if not applied appropriately there could be negative impact on landscape and townscape objectives.</p> <p>Option iii. Delete the current village frameworks entirely and provide greater flexibility for some development on the edge of villages controlled through a written policy - If frameworks were removed, the impact would depend on other policy controls to</p>

	<p>address potential negative impact of unconstrained growth on the edges of villages. Without controls it could impact on landscape and settlement character. It could potentially enable more development, but equally could negatively impact on the delivery of affordable housing exception sites. It could also have cumulative impacts on the scale of development taking place in the less sustainable villages, where there is limited access to services and facilities is a consideration, which could have a negative impact on the sustainable transport objective. Additional development could potentially make some contribution towards helping to support retention and investment in services and facilities in smaller villages, but it is uncertain whether the low quantity of development envisaged would make any significant difference given national trends.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 15: A: Do you think the new Local Plan should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. retain village frameworks and the current approach to restricting development outside framework boundaries as defined on the Proposals Map ii. retain village frameworks as defined on the Proposals Map but include policies that allow small scale development adjacent to village frameworks where certain criteria are met, addressing issues including landscape, townscape, and access. iii. delete the current village frameworks entirely and provide greater flexibility for some development on the edge of villages controlled through a written policy. <p>B. Are you aware of any existing village framework boundaries that are not drawn appropriately because they do not follow property boundaries?</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>Question 15Ai: Support: 109 Object:9 Comment: 6 Question 15Aii: Support: 69 Object: 23 Comment: 5 Question 15Aii: Support: 19 Object: 30 Comment: 2 Please provide any other comments: Support: 1 Object: 2 Comment: 18 Question 15B: Support: 8 Object: 13 Comment: 52</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>Question 15Ai: SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential to allow exceptions sites for affordable housing. • Major part of planning control at village level - provides clarity and certainty. • Resists sprawl, maintains separation between villages, preserves character and identity. • Current boundaries work well, are well established after

	<p>careful thought.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protects countryside, agricultural land and Green Belt. • Without – danger of ‘first come, first served’ development – not sustainable approach to planning. • Arrington, Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, Bourn, Cambourne, Caxton, Fen Ditton, Fowlmere, Foxton, Gamlingay, Great Shelford, Hauxton, Ickleton, Little Gransden, Milton, Pampisford, Papworth Everard, Rampton, Swavesey, Toft, Waterbeach, and Weston Colville Parish Councils support retention of current approach. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tightly drawn, paralysing modest development. • Additional, organic, growth needed to maintain vitality and viability of settlements. • Arbitrary boundaries need to include all properties to be equitable. • Need more flexible approach (consider on individual merits) not blanket constraints. • Planned development rather than piecemeal infill. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each village has its own situation which must be respected or do not block growth needlessly. • Review regularly as part of Neighbourhood Plan to reflect local needs. • Care needed not to restrict Imperial War Museum flying activities. <p>Question 15Aii:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alleviate pressure on open space within villages. • More flexibility to respond to individual’s needs for additional dwelling. • Without – danger of ‘first come, first served’ development – not sustainable approach to planning. • Balanced approach – allows small local growth, avoids stagnation, but preserves villages. • Villages should help determine criteria - should ‘fit’ development into existing village character not alter it. • Cambridgeshire County Council suggest relaxation of restrictions for certain categories of development permitted outside – e.g. schools. • Part of planning control at village level - provides clarity and certainty. • Changes to exceptions sites – closer link to market housing outside framework. • Resists sprawl, maintains separation between villages,
--	--

	<p>preserves character and identity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton, Croydon, Grantchester, Graveley, Great Abington, Haslingfield, Litlington, Little Abington, Steeple Morden, Whaddon Parish Councils support this approach. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads to more development, loss amenity – prevent over expanding. • Neighbourhood Plans should determine suitable developments. • No point having a village framework at all if this approach is adopted. • Criteria not defined adequately. • Fen Ditton Parish Council – objects to this approach. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider suitable infill sites first, only then explore small scale developments adjacent. • Needs to be pro-active planning tool not for opportunistic development. • Unlikely a District-wide formula makes sense in era of Localism. <p>Question 15Aiii:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More flexibility to provide required number of new homes, in most appropriate planned locations, and consider on merit. • Approach adopted by other authorities. • Existing boundaries artificial barrier, out of date, create unacceptable pressure within arbitrary line. • Larger population for retention and improvement of services. • Likely to deliver more affordable housing on mixed sites. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents should determine what happens – Plan unlikely to reflect local issues and concerns. • Would result in ‘free for all’, removes local control, risks sprawl and eroding character of villages. • Cambridgeshire County Council suggest relaxation of restrictions for certain categories of development permitted outside – e.g. schools. • Need more flexibility but retain framework to provide clarity and certainty. • Policy would be too complicated and risk unfair application. • Create speculative development and more work for parish and local council planning officers. • Croydon, Fen Ditton, Gamlingay, Great Shelford Parish Councils object to this approach.
--	---

Please provide any comments:

- Caldecote Parish Council - 60% Caldecote residents support retention - 30% favoured (i). Infrastructure unable to cope with further development and alter rural character.
- Should be driven by discussion with parish councils.
- Where support from parish council for development outside framework, could allow an exception.
- Cottenham Parish Council - retain frameworks as defined except where villages want expansion, provided prevent encroachment into Green Belt, coalescence. Policy govern nature of extension & S106/CIL etc.
- Allow 'organic sympathetic development'.
- English Heritage – if greater flexibility introduced character of each village needs considering when deciding scale and location of expansion.
- Great and Little Chishill – retain frameworks. If there are exceptions sites, allow market housing to fund them. Would like to explore further – may like additional, very limited development.
- None of options appropriate – needs to be discussion on village by village basis.
- Reuse old buildings but no new development.

Question 15B:

Include additional land / whole garden within village framework:

- Arrington – Church End - include unused scrub land with no potential agricultural use.
- Barrington – West Green – include whole garden.
- Bourn – Riddy Lane - include surrounding paddock land.
- Caldecote – inconsistencies along eastern edge and property excluded from western edge
- Caxton – Land off Ermine Street – extend village to include land for housing.
- Cottenham – land between 14 & 37 Ivatt Street – include land.
- Croydon – two areas of land north and south of High Street – include land in framework.
- Dry Drayton – Longwood, Scotland Road – include property in large grounds.
- Eltisley – Caxton End – include whole garden to allow single property for relative.
- Fulbourn – East of Cox's Drove – reflect development line and allow future redevelopment of wood yard (undesirable in residential area).
- Fulbourn – Apthorpe Street – include garden land.
- Graveley – Manor Farm – include house and grounds.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graveley – Land south of High Street (1) – include land in framework • Graveley – Land south of High Street (2) - include land in framework • Great Shelford – Scotsdales – include buildings. • Guilden Morden – High Street – include whole garden. • Guilden Morden – Swan Lane – include house and garden to allow single property for relative. • Hardwick – Hall Drive - include whole garden to allow single property for relative. • Hardwick – land between BP garage and village – include ribbon of development. • Little Gransden – 22 Church Street – include whole garden. Also suggested by Little Gransden Parish Council as part of a larger area. • Little Gransden – East of Primrose Hill – include as part of adjoining commercial use. • Meldreth – North End – include whole garden. • Swavesey – Boxworth End Farm – include land surrounded by residential properties. <p>Sites proposed for housing allocation / existing site option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrington – Cemex site – proposed for housing. • Cottenham – Histon Road – proposed for housing. • Cottenham – Histon Road - Site Option 27. • Croydon – land south of High Street – proposed for housing. • Duxford – Land north of Greenacres – proposed for housing. • Fowlmere – former farm yard, Cambridge Road – proposed for housing. • Great Abington – land to the east – proposed for housing. • Great Eversden – north of Chapel Road – proposed for housing. • Hardwick – St Neots Road - proposed for housing. • Hauxton – Waste Water Treatment Works (soon to be redundant) proposed for housing. • Landbeach – land off Chapmans Close - proposed for housing. • Longstanton – east of bypass – proposed for housing. • Longstanton – Clive Hall Drive – proposed for housing. • Melbourn – Victoria Way – Site Options 30 & 31. • Sawston – East of Swaston – Site Option 9. • Shepreth – Meldreth Road – proposed for housing. • Waterbeach – south of Cambridge Road – proposed for housing. <p>Amendment suggested by Parish Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton – Land north of West Street – logical extension to include white land. Suggested by individual and Comberton
--	---

	<p>Parish Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ickleton – suggest frameworks need reviewing in partnership with Parish Councils. • Little Gransden – Church Street – extend to framework to include obvious infill sites. Suggested by Little Gransden Parish Council. • Little Gransden – Land at 6 Primrose Hill – include whole garden. Also suggested by Little Gransden Parish Council. • Little Gransden – Main Road / B1046 - extend to framework to include obvious infill sites. Suggested by Little Gransden Parish Council. • Little Gransden – West of Primrose Walk - extend to framework to include obvious infill sites. Suggested by Little Gransden Parish Council. • Little Gransden – Land opposite Primrose Way - extend to framework to include obvious infill sites. • Toft – Comberton Road, near Golf Club – include offices and barns. Suggested by Toft Parish Council. • Toft – High Street – include land with planning permission for dwelling. Suggested by Toft Parish Council. • Toft – Old Farm Business Centre – include land with planning permission for new employment building. Suggested by Toft Parish Council. • Whaddon – four areas of land north and south of Meldreth Road, extending the road frontage. Suggested by Whaddon Parish Council. <p>Cottenham, Fen Ditton, Papworth Everard, Steeple Morden and Weston Colville Parish Councils – identify no changes.</p> <p>Parish boundary / framework issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton – Village College – should be included in Comberton framework (in Toft Parish). Suggested by Comberton Parish Council. • Pampisford / Sawston – London Road – include within Sawston framework (in Pampisford Parish). <p>Create new village frameworks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Croxton – Abbotsley Road / A428 - create new village framework. • Westwick – create new village framework as part of Oakington (Oakington and Westwick) to reflect the name of the Parish Council. • Waterbeach Parish Council suggests Chittering should be an Infill Village.
<p>Analysis and initial Issues and Options 2</p>	<p>The 2012 Issues and Options consultation gave the opportunity to suggest where existing village framework boundaries are not drawn appropriately. The Council received 73 representations proposing</p>

<p>Approaches</p>	<p>amendments to village framework boundaries.</p> <p>The Council assessed these against the current policy criteria – included in Appendix 9 of the Initial Sustainability Report 2013 (and also included in Appendix 1 of the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report).</p> <p>Eight suggested amendments meet the Council’s approach to identifying village frameworks and are included as Options VF1-8 (Question 6 in Issues & Options 2, Part 2).</p> <p>A number of suggested amendments to village frameworks were put forward by Parish Councils. Those considered consistent with the Council’s approach are included as Options VF1-8. However, some are not consistent with the Council’s approach but are included as Parish Council Options PC3-13 (Question 7 in Issues & Options 2, Part 2) so the consultation can demonstrate whether there is local support for them to be included under the community-led part of the Local Plan.</p>
<p>Representations Received to Issues and Options 2</p>	<p>Question 6: VF1: Support: 3 Object: 0 Comment: 0 VF2: Support: 1 Object: 3 Comment: 2 VF3: Support: 44 Object: 16 Comment: 5 VF4: Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 0 VF5: Support: 1 Object: 0 Comment: 1 VF6: Support: 21 Object: 54 Comment: 6 VF7: Support: 2 Object: 0 Comment: 0 VF8: Support: 2 Object: 0 Comment: 0</p> <p>Please provide any other comments: Support: 8 Object: 7 Comment: 66</p> <p>Question 7: PC3: Support: 36 Object: 29 Comment: 4 PC4: Support: 3 Object: 3 Comment: 6 PC5: Support: 2 Object: 9 Comment: 7 PC6: Support: 1 Object: 6 Comment: 5 PC7: Support: 3 Object: 4 Comment: 4 PC8: Support: 4 Object: 3 Comment: 5 PC9: Support: 2 Object: 1 Comment: 0 PC10: Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 4 PC11: Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 3 PC12: Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 3 PC13: Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 3</p> <p>Please provide any other comments: Support: 5 Object: 6 Comment: 10</p>

<p>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</p>	<p>Village Framework proposals were subject to analysis, to consider whether they were appropriate in terms of the purposes of frameworks. This is documented in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal 2013, which accompanied the Issues and Options 2013 consultation.</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>Question 6:</p> <p>VF1 SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote Parish Council - Simple tidying up of village border. • Makes it clearer. • Current boundary very ragged / unusual in way follows individual buildings – require straightening <p>VF2 OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discontent with the framework for Chittering. • Waterbeach Parish Council – recommend framework removed and return to previous status. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose small extension to allow a house to be built for ill relative in social housing in Waterbeach. • Boundary does not allow room for infill – suggest a bit more land is included to allow the odd plot to be developed. • Framework neither benefits nor protects village. Proposed by Parish Council to allow some housing. Include land adjacent to A10 and along School Lane / Chittering Drove. • Applaud proposal, but extend along School Lane to give uniformity on north and south sides. <p>VF3 SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes sense to allow school to develop within village framework / ensures college part of village. • Already in village - unlikely to have detrimental impact on character of village or rural landscape. • Makes sense to have CVC within our parish boundary. CVC already part of village. • Appropriate correction of anomalies. • Simply ‘tidying up’ but should not be license for CVC or any further development in Green Belt. • Ensures consistency of approach for college buildings. • Small, sensible developments. • Comberton has facilities and schools – large scale development inappropriate for small villages. • Good pedestrian access to schools, village centre and shops etc.

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt – should be maintained. • Green Belt does not need to be changed – protects character of village. Irrevocable loss of green space. • Communication between authorities, including Anglian Water needed – sewerage problems. • Object to expanding framework – must remain a village and maintain rural character. • Change will open door to changing category of village from Group to Minor Rural Centre and herald substantial development that can't sustain. • Lack of essential infrastructure, loss rural aspect, already additional housing, inadequate roads. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether buildings in or out of Green Belt irrelevant as they are in situ and unlikely to be demolished. • Comberton Parish Council – makes sense to adjust framework between Toft and Comberton so areas remote from Toft are included in Comberton to allow local people affected to have greater say. Boundary Commission will need to allow. • Comberton / Toft boundary needs to be resolved before development permitted – finance going to Toft unacceptable. • Object as map does not represent the current structure of this village. • No objection so long as kept at that. • Moving CVC into framework sensible – if Bennell Farm site developed, include in Comberton not Toft parish. <p>VF4</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guilden Morden Parish Council objects as no clear rationale has been provided. <p>VF5</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meldreth Parish Council approves inclusion of entire building which currently bisects boundary but not any of land associated with the property. <p>VF6</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this can be done it would make planning issue much easier. • Makes sense as historically regarded as part of Sawston / most people regard it as Sawston. • Feels part of Sawston. All for generating jobs in Sawston.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes sense, then Pampisford is all on one side of road, not so confusing to visitors. • Support as long as no detrimental impact on local business – will they be relocated? Good location for houses though. • Given easy access to bypass / A505, should remain industrial estate, providing employment. • Ideal for building as most road infrastructure in place. • Physically linked to Sawston, meets Council's approach to identifying village frameworks, would not undermine ST/7, strengthens Council's objective of providing certainty to local communities and developers to development in villages. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If effected, Rural Centre rather than Infill policies apply, but only apply to housing not employment (current use). Loss of employment to housing not supported. • Not supported by either parish council. Long history of separate development. Why single out this area? What is justification for Sawston Parish Council exercising power over Pampisford land? • Would create anomaly in planning and tensions between parishes. No merit to proposal – both parishes can comment on equal footing on planning applications. Loss separate identities. • No justification – nonsense if Pampisford had no influence on development in their village. Removes certainty about approaches to village development. • Seems change is to allow future housing development. • Area integral to Pampisford's nature and history. • Development would create an imbalance between residential / commercial, swamp Pampisford's community, adverse impact on village shops. • Incremental inclusion of additional land at western end of Brewery Road. • No explanation of why it is included, or advantages there are for inclusion that cannot be delivered under present arrangements. • Transfers authority to another council for whom I have not voted. • No benefits to changing – will not be considered for redevelopment. • If leads to more housing – infrastructure inadequate, road network poor, no capacity in schools, health centre and parking. • Sets dangerous precedent for further changes. • Pampisford has always been mix houses, farms, shops, light industry – changes ignore history – own heritage, thriving community - separate. • Against covering up more dwindling green spaces, possibility
--	---

	<p>of water displacement causing flooding or lack of water during droughts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentation of Pampisford. • Pampisford Parish Council – strongly objects to change that mean parish representations to planning issues would made by Sawston Parish Council. Lead to change to parish boundary. Separate communities. • Potentially removes more industrial sites reducing local employment, increasing traffic, making more commuter estate. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road and transport infrastructure does not support further development in this area. <p>VF7 SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will tidy up area and remove an anomaly. • Support Comberton / Toft as village college in Toft – new development also in the grey area between the two villages. <p>VF8 SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to existing boundary and some buildings straddle boundary. Area needs tidying up and change ensures consistency in line with VF3. • Support Comberton / Toft as village college in Toft – new development also in the grey area between the two villages. <p>Please provide any comments: SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support principle however it should not promote loss of Green Belt land. • Support these options otherwise such villages with few amenities will die. • Broadly support, provided roads are able to support traffic volume. • I see no reason not to support Parish Council proposals. • Support all if majority of local population in respective and neighbouring parishes agree. • Papworth St Agnes Parish Council – unaffected by proposals and support existing framework. • Support so each settlement can grow proportionately to its current size allowing it to evolve naturally. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village frameworks should stay as they are. Will lose character and individuality. • Villages need to look within existing boundaries. Once
--	---

	<p>moved, leaves open for future widening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If land is Green Belt, grazing or recreational, I would object to any changes. • Object to Bennell Farm, West Street, Comberton. • No – these must remain Group Villages, especially Comberton, to allow limited infill. • No change – Grantchester Parish Plan – no more houses in Grantchester, safeguard character. • Against wholesale development of fringe land – quality of housing often poor, detracts from character of village. • None, why are all these houses needed, sounds like greed to me. Nothing is affordable but great for buy to let / move out of London. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No preference so long as developments are not large scale, good farming land not lost. Large scale developments should go where infrastructure and local services can cope. • Cottenham should be looking to develop more agriculture around village not houses. • Localism - wishes of the locals should be respected / up to the villages involved to give their opinions. Parish Councils do not always reflect parishioners' views. • Bennells Farm, if developed, is sufficient. • Dry Drayton Parish Council – no views on amendments in Table 5.2. • No problem with proposed changes, provided they do not encroach / impact other villages. • If local Parish Council supports, it should be supported. • Would not support enlarging these villages except Comberton. • Controlled village developments maybe with proposed sites - and others? • Ickleton Parish Council – as plan period so long, needs to be mechanism to bring forward proposals later if local support for changes. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – business of each Parish Council. • Areas within villages should be considered – renovation of larger houses into flats should be encouraged. • Boundaries may have to change to accommodate social housing – Parish Councils have hard decisions to make. • I would be suspicious such requests reflect secondary personal interests. • Use sites within villages first before greenfield land is proposed for development. Natural order to any further expansion of a village – common sense. • Why implement frameworks if they are liable to change at any time.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shepreth Parish Council – no objection to proposals, but object to Cambridgeshire County Council’s attempt to include their land, particularly as no consultation was undertaken. • Great Chishill’s boundaries should remain as are – no expansion – housing (affordable or otherwise) or commercial. Quietude should be retained. • Too tight restrictions on development boundaries leads to high land costs and unaffordable homes. • These villages can accommodate more housing, but more services must be provided. Whaddon has no shop, school, doctor. More traffic. Park and Ride needed near Barton. • Comberton has successful CVC and Cambourne building new VC – so spare capacity? • Phrase “flexibility” means changing the rules to suit the purpose and ignoring reason restrictions put in place to start with. <p>Proposed Amendments to Village Frameworks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote – mobile home park – include in framework. • Cottenham – Ivatt Street - land for 1 or 2 houses. • Croxton – Abbotsley Road and A428 – new framework • Fowlmere – triangle site – incorporate social housing. • Girton – south of Huntingdon Road – part of Girton – anomaly that excluded. • Guilden Morden - Dubbs Knoll Road – affordable housing. • Linton – village green / Paynes Meadow (suggested by Linton Parish Council) • Longstanton – High Street – anomaly - house in large grounds. • Orwell – Hillside – new framework (suggested by Orwell Parish Council). • Orwell – Fisher’s Lane - allow business to expand. • Sawston – Whitefield Way – anomaly - garden / Green Belt boundary. • Steeple Morden – Trap Road – include garden. • Waterbeach – Land at Poorsfield Road - SHLAA Sites 142, 043 and 270 – land for housing. <p>Question 7:</p> <p>PC3 SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC3 makes sense. Sensible use of eyesore. • Support - land currently unused and un-useful! Not attractive; no wildlife; should be available to PC for small scale development. • Unlikely to have detrimental effect on character of village, rural landscape, cause noticeable effect on traffic volumes,
--	---

	<p>additional loading on sewage / drainage system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton parish is most logical place for these sites to be considered. • A smaller building site is more acceptable. • PC3 needs filling with 3-4 low cost high density key worker homes, currently wasteland / unsightly • Simply 'tidying up' but should not be license for CVC or any further development in Green Belt. • Natural extension to framework and suitable for single dwelling without affecting village character. • Within Toft parish – may be available as exception site if not included in framework. If H10 comes forward, no reason why change not take place. • Relates to built form not countryside, separated by mature and defensible boundary. Logical conclusion to development on north side of West Street. Not involve change to Green Belt. • Supported by Toft and Comberton Parish Councils • Single house only. • Good pedestrian access to school, village centre and shops etc. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsuitable for development because of traffic. • Loss of Green Belt – must be maintained. • Green Belt does not need to be changed – protect character of village. Incremental development creates irrevocable loss of green space. • Object to changes to framework regardless of whether parish council support. Framework should fulfil intention of preventing urbanising the countryside / restricting unsuitable development. • Unsure how this affects village. • Communication between authorities, including Anglian Water needed – sewerage problems. • Should not be developed – outside framework – subject to large numbers objections over years, upheld at appeal. • Opposite access to CVC with 20+ buses, coincides with end of cycle way - dangerous. • Object as map does not represent the current structure of the village. • Lack of essential infrastructure, loss rural aspect, already have additional housing, inadequate road. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large number of additional housing units required - fail to understand why concerned with options VF3 and PC3. PC3 seems to relate to provision of one dwelling - hardly going to impact on housing needs. • Comberton Parish Council – makes sense to adjust
--	--

	<p>framework between Toft and Comberton so areas remote from Toft are included in Comberton to allow local people affected to have greater say. Boundary Commission will need to allow.</p> <p>PC4</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In favour of new housing here. • Land opposite subject of outline planning application, therefore PC4 becomes a natural and logical site for future village infill. • Not in conservation area, not visible from listed building • Two separate points of vehicular access. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework should fulfil the intention of preventing urbanising the countryside and restricting sustainable development. • Will almost double developed area. • Significant character change. • Overload road and drainage systems. • Inflate land prices. • Pockets for infill development within village framework. • Lack of biodiversity consideration. • Lack of infrastructure. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential that great thought is given to the existing feel of the village. • Some areas could be enhanced by small-scale, careful, sympathetic planning. • More drive access would be required, speed issues along Primrose Hill. • Would detract from present privacy. • Too extensive. • No discussion or consultation with residents. • To improve our village and make more infill sites • No objection to single infill properties, strongly <p>PC5</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support all. • Support as infill only. Giving local families the opportunities to stay in village grown up in. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework should fulfil the intention of preventing urbanising the countryside and restricting sustainable development. • Lack of detailed explanation or justification. • Ancient historic character would be compromised. • Biodiversity or wildlife would be compromised. • Car parking issue.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No discussion about improving infrastructure. • Should not include “bulge” to the East – compromise the watercourse. • Serious drainage issues. • Will almost double developed area. • Significant character change. • Overload road and drainage systems. • Inflate land prices. • Pockets for infill development within village framework. • Lack of biodiversity consideration. • Lack of infrastructure. • Highly sensitive entrance to the village would be spoilt. • Hazardous road access. • Further development inappropriate. • Increase in surface run off issues. • Not part of conurbation. • What control would villagers have over what is built there? <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage and run off. • Wildlife area. • Boundary should not go east of brook. • Ensure brook is not compromised – could lead to flooding. • Essential that great thought is given to the existing feel of the village. • Too extensive. • No discussion or consultation with residents. • Perhaps an ‘island’ insertion for a dwelling to replace the dilapidated barn could be considered rather than extending the area up from the village. • To improve our village and make more infill sites • No objection to single infill properties but I strongly oppose any major house building projects. <p>PC6</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support all. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework should fulfil the intention of preventing urbanising the countryside and restricting sustainable development. • Within Conservation Area. • Part of the proposed infill site would require access off the bridleway. • Church Street should be identified as an ICF. • Will almost double developed area. • Significant character change. • Overload road and drainage systems. • Inflate land prices. • Pockets for infill development within village framework.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of biodiversity consideration. • Lack of infrastructure. • Inappropriate to put new housing amongst listed buildings on a quiet dead-end road. • Already issues for turning vehicles, including lorries. • Development would destroy the rural ambience and setting. • Road is more of a lane and often congested with parked cars. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undeveloped plot of land included in PC6 but excluded in PC6A is an ideal plot for a suitable house to be built on. • Essential that great thought is given to the existing feel of the village. • Sensitive part of the village with a combination of significant listed properties and extremely poor access. • Infill will damage the settings of some of the most beautiful houses in the village. • An increase traffic along the single track road will damage the verges and local ecology. • Too extensive. • No discussion or consultation with residents. • No objection to single infill properties but I strongly oppose any major house building projects. <p>PC7</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In favour of new housing here. • Support all. • Support as infill only. Giving local families the opportunities to stay in village grown up in. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework should fulfil the intention of preventing urbanising the countryside and restricting sustainable development. • Will almost double developed area. • Significant character change. • Overload road and drainage systems. • Inflate land prices. • Pockets for infill development within village framework. • Lack of biodiversity consideration. • Lack of infrastructure. • Area is of outstanding beauty enjoyed by ramblers, children etc. • Loss of footpath, surrounding wooded area and hedgerows would be disastrous for wildlife. • Road is barely width of a single car – could not cope with construction lorries. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential that great thought is given to the existing feel of the
--	--

village.

PC8

SUPPORT:

- In favour of new housing here.
- Support all.
- Being the only road frontage in Primrose Hill not built-up this makes obvious sense.
- Support as infill only. Giving local families the opportunities to stay in the village they have grown up in.

OBJECTIONS:

- Framework should fulfil the intention of preventing urbanising the countryside and restricting sustainable development.
- Will almost double developed area.
- Significant character change.
- Overload road and drainage systems.
- Inflate land prices.
- Pockets for infill development within village framework.
- Lack of biodiversity consideration.
- Lack of infrastructure.

COMMENTS:

- Essential that great thought is given to the existing feel of the village.
- Too extensive.
- No discussion or consultation with residents.
- To improve our village and make more infill sites.
- No objection to single infill properties but I strongly oppose any major house building projects.

Other Little Gransden Comments:

SUPPORT:

- In favour of new housing here.
- Support all.
- Being the only road frontage in Primrose Hill not built-up this makes obvious sense.

OBJECTIONS:

- Neither necessary nor desirable - double size village.
- Maintain 'Infill-only' policy.
- Not opposed to one or two additional houses.
- Would open up village to over-development and damage its integrity, especially loose ribbon development.
- Parish Council submitted proposals without prior consultation.
- Need for biodiversity appraisal to protect and enhance wildlife habitats.
- Ancient centre of village is Conservation Area. Since 1986, 30 houses built without detriment to integrity - demonstrates infill-only policy successful.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village does not require development to sustain long term - several areas within few miles. • Lack of infrastructure, prone to flooding and inadequate drainage. • No minutes of PC meeting, but concern that views will be played down or ignored. • Too extensive. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four of the five proposals are closely linked to the members of the Parish Council. • Why were parishioners not offered the chance at an open forum to discuss or gauge public feelings? • Matter seems to have been conducted behind closed doors. • Other places in the village could have been included in the proposal don't appear to have been considered. • For the last 30 years or so planning permission for a bungalow in The Drift has been turned down – the reason it was turned down should also apply to the new proposals. • Disappointed not to have been consulted. • All infill areas developed so must be accepted that either Little Gransden remains static or the village framework be amended. • Important to maintain small green spaces in the village rather than building on them – important in maintaining habitats, views and environments which are essential to the character of the village. <p>PC9</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including this area within framework allows it to be tidied up – next to houses on edge of framework, gateway to village. Ensures consistency of approach with VF3 and VF8. • Support inclusion of buildings next to golf club – commercial use, not Green Belt, partly within Conservation Area which indicates close relationship to village- part of unbroken frontage. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPRE – object regardless of whether there is Parish Council support. Framework should prevent urbanising countryside and restricting unsustainable development. <p>PC10</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPRE – object regardless of whether there is Parish Council support. Framework should prevent urbanising countryside and restricting unsustainable development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible approach to infilling etc. could improve overall
--	--

	<p>appearance of nice village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orwell Parish Council – major concerns with development if sewerage feeds into Foxton Sewerage Works, as out-dated facility frequently exceeds capacity - impact on Orwell and Wimpole. • May take pressure off surrounding villages a little. • English Heritage - May appear logical 'rounding off' but historic map in Whaddon Village Design Statement shows part of last vestiges of 'Great Green'. Development of site would mask historic form of village and potentially impact on setting of two Grade II listed former farmhouses. <p>PC11</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPRE – object regardless of whether there is Parish Council support. Framework should prevent urbanising countryside and restricting unsustainable development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible approach to infilling etc. could improve overall appearance of nice village. • Orwell Parish Council – major concerns with development if sewerage feeds into Foxton Sewerage Works, as out-dated facility frequently exceeds capacity - impact on Orwell and Wimpole. • May take pressure off surrounding villages a little. <p>PC12</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPRE – object regardless of whether there is Parish Council support. Framework should prevent urbanising countryside and restricting unsustainable development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible approach to infilling etc. could improve overall appearance of nice village. • Orwell Parish Council – major concerns with development if sewerage feeds into Foxton Sewerage Works, as out-dated facility frequently exceeds capacity - impact on Orwell and Wimpole. • May take pressure off surrounding villages a little. <p>PC13</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPRE – object regardless of whether there is Parish Council support. Framework should prevent urbanising countryside and restricting unsustainable development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible approach to infilling etc. could improve overall appearance of nice village.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orwell Parish Council – major concerns with development if sewerage feeds into Foxton Sewerage Works, as out-dated facility frequently exceeds capacity - impact on Orwell and Wimpole. • May take pressure off surrounding villages a little. <p>Please provide any comments:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support all of them as much better idea to allow for small villages to stay viable and sustainable than have massive new towns. • Orwell Parish Council – support all if majority of local population in respective parishes and neighbouring parishes agree. • Teversham Parish Council – parish councils and local communities should be supported in achieving schemes that have local support. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not support extensions of current outlying villages into undeveloped land around village perimeters – loss character and individuality. • Concern about continuing loss farmland and Green Belt. • Object to PC4-8 – permission turned down for bungalow on Drift now plans for development at other end of street – same reasoning would apply. • Object to parish councils making changes to boundaries of their villages – infrastructure cannot cope with more houses – roads, transport links. • Acknowledge some infill needed but Little Gransden proposals too extensive. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None if Green Belt lost. • Cottenham Parish Council - Option 1 require amendment of V/F, as affordable housing needs to be guaranteed for first refusal to those in need in village - affordable home sites need to be identified in advance of V/F amendment to remain adjacent but outside. Options 2 and 3 require V/F amendment that predetermines specific uses for land, including: industrial, recreational, green open-space, housing, roads. • Litlington Parish Council - whilst retaining village framework, consider small amounts of development outside, where strict requirements met, and support of Parish Council. • Natural England - concerns with Parish Council proposals - seek to include areas comprising sporadic agricultural outbuildings, farm tracks. Risk will encourage further development and potentially cause harm to natural environment and landscape character.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little Gransden – 4 of 5 proposals closely linked to members of parish council. Parishioners not offered chance to discuss – other changes could have been included. Either accept village remains static or make changes. Green spaces important to habitats, views and environments essential to character of village which may justify protection as Local Green Space.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include a development framework policy allowing infill development to occur in villages, and restricting development in the countryside to uses that need to be located there or consistent with other policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>On balance it is considered that not including frameworks would undermine the sustainable development strategy being established through the plan, by loosening controls on the scale of development in rural areas. It could also undermine the delivery of affordable housing exception sites, which are important mechanism for meeting affordable housing needs in rural areas. Elements of flexibility have been introduced for specific uses by other policies in the plan, and a general loosening of development framework policy is not required.</p> <p>The village frameworks boundaries will be carried forward from the adopted plan, together with a small number of amendments as follows: Options VF1, VF3, VF4, VF5, VF7, VF8, PC3, Hillside at Orwell, and White Field Way at Sawston.</p> <p>There was support for most of the Village Framework options consulted upon in Issues and Options 2, with the exception of Options VF2 and VF6. VF2 was originally proposed by Waterbeach Parish Council who subsequently objected and requested its removal. Option VF6 clearly did not have local support and will not be taken forward.</p> <p>One change proposed by Parish Councils (PC3) is being taken forward. Although this change is not consistent with the Council's approach to frameworks, it reflects local support for minor amendments to provide greater flexibility and to take account of local circumstances. As this change has been proposed by the Parish Council, it is shown in a different colour on the proposals map so it can be differentiated from the frameworks developed by the Council.</p> <p>Options PC1, PC2 and PC4-13 did not demonstrate sufficient local support and should not be included within the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Through the Issues & Options 2 consultation, 12 new village framework amendments were proposed. Two had previously been</p>

	<p>submitted through Issues and Options 1 and not considered appropriate. A proposal from Orwell Parish Council is consistent with the policy approach and will be included in the draft Local Plan to gauge whether there is local support for it, with a view to it being removed from the Submission Local Plan if there is not support for it. A minor technical amendment to the boundary at Sawston will also be included in the draft Local Plan. None of the other eight proposed amendments were considered to be consistent with the policy approach and therefore will not be included in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Appendix 1 (Evidence Paper on Village Frameworks) includes a complete list of the suggested village framework amendments and maps of the proposed change, together with the Council's assessment of them.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy S/7: Development Frameworks
Policy S/7: Development Frameworks (and Paragraphs 2.48 to 2.49)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 131 Support: 55 (including 4 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 76 (including 4 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Wildlife Trust – Pleased recognition of need to protect and enhance features of local ecological importance. • Bassingbourn PC – Support boundaries and rejection of 7 SHLAA sites. • Bourn PC & – Fowlmere PC – Support. • Papworth Everard PC – Strongly support retention to control and limit expansion of Minor Rural Centres and smaller villages. • Barrington PC – Development on land at Barrington Quarry (Cemex proposal) would not be compatible with local character. • Comberton PC – Support change (PC3) - white land outside Green Belt - logical regardless whether Bennell Farm is allocated. • Fulbourn PC – Support Fulbourn development framework. (16) • Little Gransden PC – Strongly support rejection of expansion. Unlikely to provide social housing. Infrastructure unsuitable. • Vital to keep development cohesive and sustainable - protects communities (avoids isolation) & village / countryside character. • Controls development whilst not restricting local growth. Small villages tend not to have infrastructure for large developments. • Brownfield sites should not be considered just because they are brownfield – take account of effect on villages. • Criterion 1a - Developments must be small enough to integrate into village community and effective provision of local services.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criterion 1c – Strongly agree – doctors, schools, roads. • Criterion 2 – Vital to prevent ‘planning creep’. If no need to locate in countryside, should be in urban location for access and infrastructure as much as preservation. ‘Other uses’ vague. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – Include reference to drainage infrastructure. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Support, but could impact being able to respond to demand for school places. Suggest change wording to permit key community infrastructure outside. • Bourn PC – Strongly favour maintaining to ensure settlements don’t coalesce / lose character. Define “previously developed”. • Great Abington PC – Approach leaves smaller villages with few development opportunities. Local need cannot be met on exception sites - allow minor amendments to meet needs. • Ickleton PC – Rare occasions where flexibility would be welcome if proposal clearly backed by the parish council. • Whaddon PC – Want to review boundaries to address future housing requirements without producing a Neighbourhood Plan. • Approach taken is unduly restrictive. Not consistent with principle of support for sustainable development in NPPF. • Some parishes would like frameworks changed where it would meet identified needs, of appropriate size and has local support. • Should require brownfield first in accordance with NPPF. • Criterion 2 – At odds with NPPF & Policy H/10. Appropriate to develop outside for local housing need / more appropriate use for site. Can deliver / sustain new / improved services. <p>Objections proposing amendments to framework boundaries at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrington – Land west of Orwell Road • Bassingbourn – Land north of Elbourn Way • Caldecote - Land to the rear of 18-28 Highfields Road • Caldecote – Mobile Home Park • Comberton - Birdlines Manor Farm, South Street • Cottenham - Land at the Junction, Long Drove and Beach Rd • Croxton - Properties fronting Abbotsley Road and A428 • Dry Drayton – Longwood • Duxford - Rear of 8 Greenacres • Eltisley - Caxton End • Fowlmere - Land west of High Street • Fowlmere - Land at Triangle Farm • Fulbourn - Balsham Road and Home End • Fulbourn - 36 Apthorpe Street • Gamlingay – Land at Potton Road • Girton - Southern side of Huntingdon Road • Graveley – Toseland Road • Great Abington - Land east of Great Abington & Land at
--	---

	<p>Pampisford Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Shelford - Land south of Great Shelford Caravan and Camping Club, Cambridge Road • Great Shelford - Land off Mingle Lane, Great Shelford • Great Shelford - Scotsdales Garden Centre • Guilden Morden - Land south of 33 Dubbs Knoll Road • Hardwick - Land at Rectory Farm • Harston - Land to the rear of 98 - 102 High Street • Harston - North of Haslingfield Road • Harston – Button End • Harston – various amendments • Histon and Impington - Land west of 113 Cottenham Road, Histon • Histon and Impington – Land north of Impington Lane, Impington • Horningsea - Garden Centre, High Street • Ickleton – Land to rear of Old Vicarage, Butcher’s Hill • Linton - Land adjacent to Paynes Meadow • Litlington - Land at Longview, 1 Manor Farm Barns, Crockhall Lane • Little Gransden - 84 Main Road • Little Gransden - Land to rear of 4 Primrose Hill • Little Gransden - Land at The Drift • Little Gransden - South of Main Road (PC5) • Little Gransden - Bounding 6 Primrose Hill, (PC4) • Longstanton - Melrose House • Meldreth - Bury Farm, North End • Meldreth - Land r/o 79 High Street • Orwell - Volac International • Pampisford - Land East of High Street • Pampisford - London Road • Papworth Everard - Land at The Ridgeway • Sawston - Land to the rear of 41 Mill Lane • Toft - Buildings adjacent to Meridian Court • Waterbeach - Bannold Road • Waterbeach - Land off Bannold Road / Bannold Drove • Waterbeach - Land off Gibson Close • Whittlesford - Ryecroft Paddock
Assessment	<p>The policy has been carried forward from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The policy requires the availability of infrastructure to serve development. Specific reference to drainage infrastructure is not required, as it is addressed by other policies in the plan.</p> <p>It is not appropriate for the plan to allow for key community infrastructure to be provided outside frameworks, as they should be in accessible locations. Where not possible this could be considered as an exception through the planning application</p>

	<p>process dealing with each case on its merits. The policy provides flexibility for some uses to be located outside frameworks, and extension of school playing fields into the countryside could be considered consistent with policy.</p> <p>Previously developed land is defined in the Glossary.</p> <p>The Council consulted on options for frameworks: to retain as they are, retain but allow some development on the edge of villages, or delete them. There was clear support for retaining village frameworks along existing lines and on balance it was considered that changing the approach to frameworks would undermine the sustainable development strategy, by loosening controls on the scale of development in rural areas. It could also undermine delivery of affordable housing exception sites; important for meeting affordable housing needs in rural areas. Flexibility has been introduced for specific uses by other policies in the plan.</p> <p>The Council assessed proposals put forward during the Issues and Options consultations to amend framework boundaries and consulted on options, including Parish Council Proposals, in Issues and Options 2. The Council included those with demonstrable local support within the plan. Proposals by Great and Little Abington Parish Councils for housing development and framework changes are addressed at Policy H/1 and changes proposed to include the Parish-led proposals. Proposals by Whaddon Parish Council for housing development and framework changes are also considered at Policy H/1. Further Parish Council changes can be included within Neighbourhood Development Plans if desired by the local community or the next review of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The principle of focusing development on brownfield land where available and in suitable locations has influenced the strategy and policies, including allocations for development. Any further development, permitted within frameworks will be windfalls as opportunities arise; by its nature it is not possible to prioritise such development.</p> <p>Policy H/10: Rural Exception Sites for Affordable Housing is consistent with the NPPF and Policy S/7: Development Frameworks as it allows affordable housing outside frameworks as an exception to the normal rule (Policy S/7) in order to meet an identified local need. Where viability is an issue, a minimum amount of market housing will be permitted. The scale of development is limited to the identified needs and settlement characteristics.</p> <p>50 amendments to framework boundaries were proposed by objectors; these are considered in Table 3 of the Development</p>
--	--

	<p>Frameworks evidence paper update. One is already within the framework (Ref. 78) and another seeks to amend the boundary of a housing allocation in the Local Plan (Ref. 104). One site has planning permission to demolish two barns and replace them with offices with a “traditional agricultural character” (Ref. 122). One has planning permission (Ref. 81) and another outline planning permission (Ref. 111) for residential development. Once implemented, it can be considered at the next plan review whether they should be included in the framework. 19 are new sites and the remainder have been considered previously, as a proposed amendment to the framework and/or a proposed SHLAA site. No changes are proposed.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Policy S/8: Rural Centres

<p>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 13</p>	<p>Rural Settlement Categories</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village Services and Facilities Study: Report 2012 • Village Classification Report June 2012
<p>Existing policies</p>	<p>Core Strategy DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ST/4 Rural Centres • ST/5 Minor Rural Centres • ST/6 Group Villages • ST/7 Infill Villages.
<p>Analysis</p>	<p>The current plan groups villages into 4 categories that reflect their relative sustainability in terms of location and function, size, services and facilities, and accessibility to Cambridge or a market town by sustainable modes of transport, particularly by bus or train. Having appropriate village groupings is important both to help direct new housing allocations to the most sustainable locations and also to help inform the policies for windfall development in villages to make sure that such development is appropriate in scale and reflects the relative sustainability of the village. Villages are currently categorised as Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centre, Group Villages or Infill Villages.</p> <p>The Village Classification Report (June 2012) responds to the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework that ‘planning policies and decisions should actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.’ The paper provides a review of the village hierarchy, reviewing the previously used methodology and the impact of any changes in village circumstances. The existing settlement hierarchy is then re-assessed, and options for revisions to the hierarchy identified.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The review looked at the larger villages (all those over 3000 population as before, plus those over 2000 population to test whether any others should be considered). This has broadly confirmed the split between the less sustainable majority of villages i.e. Group and Infill villages, and the more sustainable larger villages.</p> <p>However, it did suggest that there was a case to review the split between Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres in respect of two villages and it identified that a number of additional villages of between 2000 and 3000 population should be considered as possible Minor Rural Centres, performing better than some of the current villages in that category, or that a new category of Better</p>

	<p>Served Group Villages be added, primarily because they contain a secondary school or are very close to the edge of Cambridge.</p> <p>Options existed around the way the more sustainable villages are categorised, which is demonstrated by the summary of the assessment of the larger villages contained as Appendix 3 to the Issues and Options report and contained in the Village Classification Report. No changes were proposed to the remaining Group and Infill villages on the basis that there were not considered to be reasonable options in view of their relative sustainability.</p> <p>The impact of the new Guided Busway on villages along the route was investigated as part of the assessment process. The three larger villages of Oakington, Longstanton and Over lie relatively close to the Guided Busway. They are not generally in easy walking distance for much, or all, of the village, although they would be within cycling distance. They also do not perform well in terms of the level of services and facilities. It was therefore not considered that the villages warrant a higher status despite being near to the Guided Busway.</p> <p>The issue of the approach to development at all villages is considered separately at Issues 14 and 15. A number of options for village classification were identified for consultation under this issue, covering the range of reasonable options identified through the analysis in the Report as contained in Question 14.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and</p>

	train.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 13: Which, if any, of the following changes to the rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?</p> <p>Rural Centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Should Cottenham be added as a Rural Centre (up from a Minor Rural Centre)? ii. Should Fulbourn be deleted from the Rural Centre category and added as a Minor Rural Centre? <p>Minor Rural Centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Should the following be added as Minor Rural Centres? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Milton - Swavesey - Bassingbourn - Girton - Comberton <p>Better Served Group Villages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Should there be a further sub division of village categories to create a new category of better served group villages? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Milton - Swavesey - Bassingbourn - Girton - Comberton v. If so, should the 3 Minor Rural Centres that score less than the Better Served Group villages be changed to fall within this new category? They are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Papworth Everard - Willingham - Waterbeach <p>Other Group Villages and Infill Villages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. Should these remain in the same categories as in the current plan?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	The focus of this appraisal has been the principle of including the settlement hierarchy. It is difficult to consider in detail the individual positions. The options have been identified reviewing the access to public transport, education, services and facilities and employment, with a detailed review in a separate evidence paper. Taking on board these issues means that the hierarchy has been designed to reflect a number of the sustainability objectives: access to services and facilities, access to work, and sustainable travel. Location and scale of development is addressed by other options.
Representations Received	Question 13: Which, if any, of the following changes to the rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?

	<p><u>Rural Centres:</u> i.) Should Cottenham be added as a Rural Centre (up from a Minor Rural Centre)? (S:21 (1 PC), O:6 , C: 11) ii.) Should Fulbourn be deleted from the Rural Centre category and added as a Minor Rural Centre? (S:52 (1 PC), O: 11(1:PC), C: 12)</p> <p><u>Minor Rural Centres:</u> iii.)Should the following be added as Minor Rural Centres? (S:22 (4 PC), O: 80 (5:PC), C: 11)</p> <p><u>Better Served Group Villages:</u> iv.) Should there be a further sub division of village categories to create a new category of better served group villages? (S: 11 (2:PC), O: 54 (4:PC), C:11) v.) If so, should the 3 Minor Rural Centres that score less than the Better Served Group villages be changed to fall within this new category? (S: 6 (3:PC), O: 15 (3:PC), C:9 (1:PC))</p> <p><u>Other Group Villages and Infill Villages:</u> vi.) Should these remain in the same categories as in the current plan? (S:14 (6:PC), O: 23 (1:PC), C:25 (1:PC))</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p><u>Rural Centres:</u> i.) Should Cottenham be added as a Rural Centre (up from a Minor Rural Centre)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Sound” approach - accords with Village Classification report. • Cottenham Parish Council – District Council should consult with village on any changes proposed • Cottenham Design Group – Not convinced that evidence to merit change. • Histon and Impington Parish Council challenges Rural Centre status ii.) Should Fulbourn be deleted from the Rural Centre category and added as a Minor Rural Centre? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks services and facilities to meet Rural Centre threshold and smaller than other Minor Rural Centres. View supported by Fulbourn Forum for Community Action and Fulbourn Parish Council. • Reclassification would limit growth - affect viability of businesses and shops. <p><u>Minor Rural Centres:</u> iii.) Should the following be added as Minor Rural Centres? Milton; Swavesey; Bassingbourn; Girton and Comberton <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Bassingbourn</u> - demise of army barracks provides opportunity to create MRC. Supported by Cambridgeshire County </p> </p>

	<p>Council. Objection from Bassingbourn PC and Action Group; Litlington PC. Bassingbourn and Kneesworth should be considered as one</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Milton</u> – support. Should be upgraded to reflect scores in Village Classification report. Links to employment and Cambridge. • <u>Swavesey</u> – support upgrade to MRC status (or at least Better Served Group Village) to reflect scores in Village Classification report. Swavesey PC objects. Middle Level Commissioners concerned over development in village and impact on drains and flooding. development will need to mitigate • <u>Comberton</u> – Objections from Caldecote and Comberton PC • <u>Girton</u> – Facilities do not merit change <p><u>Better Served Group Villages:</u></p> <p>iv) Should there be a further sub division of village categories to create a new category of better served group villages? Milton; Swavesey; Bassingbourn; Girton and Comberton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current categories work well – don't change. • <u>Swavesey</u> – support upgrade to MRC status (or at least Better Served Group Village) to reflect scores in Village Classification report. Objection as development would lead to loss of linear character and Village classification report does not support change. Middle Level Commissioners – concerns over development in Swavesey and impacts on drains and flooding – development will need to mitigate. • <u>Bassingbourn</u> – Support from Cambridgeshire County Council and Litlington PC. Objections from Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council and Action Group. Village classification report does not support change • <u>Comberton</u> – should be upgraded – recognises better performing than other Group Villages but objection from Caldecote and Comberton Parish Councils. Subdivision of category just makes hierarchy more complex. Village classification report does not support change • <u>Girton</u> – support for new category. Objection that Village classification report does not support change • <u>Milton</u> - Objection that Village classification report does not support this change <p>v.) If so, should the 3 Minor Rural Centres that score less than the Better Served Group villages be changed to fall within this new category? Papworth Everard; Willingham and Waterbeach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Papworth</u> - Papworth Everard Parish Council – Papworth does not merit being a MRC. Objection that downgrading status would affect delivery of services. Potential for service improvement should be considered.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Willingham</u> – Objections to change- MRC reflects services and facilities. Rampton PC will be affected by Northstowe so changing category irrelevant. • <u>Waterbeach</u> - Waterbeach Parish Council support downgrading of Waterbeach in recognition of less infrastructure than other MRC. Objections to downgrade since village has MRC level of services <p><u>Other Group Villages and Infill Villages:</u> vi.) Should these remain in the same categories as in the current plan?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of villages supporting the category they are currently in - Caxton, Foxton, Over, Weston Colville, Caldecote, Guilden Morden, Pampisford. • Number of suggestions that villages should be upgraded to allow for more development as they have not been scored correctly in Village Classification Report – 17 villages. <p><u>Suggestions for other changes in category:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other suggestions that Cambourne should be Minor Rural Centre • Other suggestions that Linton and Melbourn should be Rural Centres <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council - changes to village classification may impact on library provision – current hierarchy corresponds to County Council’s Service Level Policy based on population catchment sizes. • Villages should be categorised, but current levels of facilities not necessarily a guide to capacity of a village for further development.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>The preferred approach was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add Cottenham as Rural Centre. • Add Fulbourn, Milton, Swavesey, Bassingbourn, Girton, and Comberton to the list of Minor Rural Centres. • Do not include a separate category of ‘Better served Group Villages’. <p>A variety of views have been received to the various suggested changes to specific villages.</p> <p>Cottenham compares favourably with existing rural centres, whilst Fulbourn does not, and compares better with existing Minor Rural Centres. They should therefore be swapped.</p> <p>Five settlements stood out above existing Group villages, particularly due to the presence of employment, public transport, secondary education and proximity to Cambridge. Rather than</p>

creating an additional stage, these have been included as Minor Rural Centres. This reduces complexity of the hierarchy, and these factors justify their higher position in the hierarchy.

Responding to specific issues raised in representations:

- Capacity for further development is addressed by other policies in the Local Plan;
- Cambourne compares favourably with other Rural Centres, and future service improvements will add to these (although it does not compare to a market town);
- Fulbourn – Does not benefit from direct high quality public transport to Bottisham Village College, Tesco is 3km from the village centre. The Ida Darwin hospital site is being redeveloped for residential uses;
- Balsham – Whilst it is on a bus route to Linton Village College is not a high quality service, it is therefore scored correctly. It does not compare favourably with higher order settlements, and is correctly classified;
- Barrington – The settlement correctly classified as a group village. It is not a sustainable location for a significant scale of development;
- Bassingbourn / Kneesworth – Representation seeks for the two villages to be considered as one in the hierarchy. Due to the distance and separation between the two this would not be appropriate, and Kneesworth should remain an Infill village;
- Chittering - Comprises a small hamlet, and does not merit a village framework and classification as an Infill village;
- Comberton – although the village college is in the parish of Toft, it is highly accessible to Comberton;
- Duxford – This small village has an hourly bus service, and very limited services and facilities. It scores well on the employment category due to the industrial area to the south of the village. This does not merit a higher status;
- Fen Drayton – Small village with an hourly bus service, no food shop and limited other services and facilities. It is correctly classified as a Group Village;
- Fowlmere - a small village with few services and facilities and limited public transport. It is correctly classified as a group village;
- Great and Little Abington, even when combined have a population only around 1300. The villages are separated by around 500m. There is a small village store and few other services and facilities. It both villages are correctly classified as Group villages;
- Great and Little Eversden – The villages do not have a primary school. They are correctly classified as infill villages;
- Hardwick benefits the bus service of the A428 corridor, but its range of other services and facilities is limited. It is not in the

	<p>catchment area of Cambourne Village College;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harston – The representor notes high quality transport services in nearby settlements. This is not sufficient justification to upgrade a village, which has been correctly categorised as a Group Village; • Linton – Public transport to market town is similar to the service to Cambridge, and is correctly scored. It offers similar services to other minor rural centres, and is correctly placed in the hierarchy; • Melbourn do not compare to the Rural Centres, which identifies the small number of highest order villages in the district; • Meldreth – Apart from the train station, providing a 30min service at peak times, it is a small village containing few services and facilities. It does not warrant a higher status; • Oakington, Longstanton and Over lie relatively close to the Guided Busway. They are not generally in easy walking distance for much, or all, of the village, although they would be within cycling distance. They also do not perform well in terms of the level of services and facilities. It is therefore not considered that the villages warrant a higher status despite being near to the Guided Busway; • Over – Over has limited services and facilities, and is correctly identified as a Group Village. It does not compare favourably with higher order settlements. The guided busway stop at Swavesey is over 1km from the village; • Whittlesford / Whittlesford Bridge – Whittlesford Bridge is over 1km from the centre of Whittlesford, along a rural road. Apart from the railway station it has few services, and does not warrant a higher status.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy S/8: Rural Centres, Policy S/9: Minor Rural Centres, Policy S/10: Group Villages, Policy S/11: Infill Villages

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 14	Scale of Housing Development at Villages
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village Services and Facilities Study: Report 2012 • Village Classification Report June 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11
Existing policies	<p>Core Strategy DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ST/4 Rural Centres • ST/5 Minor Rural Centres • ST/6 Group Villages • ST/7 Infill Villages.
Analysis	The current plan sets the amount of development that can take place at the different categories of village through windfall development (sites not allocated in the plan) based on their relative sustainability.

For Rural Centres, there is no limit of the size of a development, reflecting that they are the best served and most accessible villages. In Minor Rural Centres, development is limited to an indicative maximum scheme size of 30 dwellings, with developments towards the upper end that place a burden on local services and facilities expected to make financial contributions towards improving them. Development in Group villages is limited to 8 dwellings, with exceptionally up to 15 dwellings being acceptable where it makes the best use of a single brownfield site. Development in Infill villages is limited to 2 dwellings, with exceptionally up to 8 being acceptable where it makes the best use of a single brownfield site.

A question for the new plan was whether the current limits on the scale of development that can come forward on windfall sites remain appropriate or whether there should be a different approach. In view of the continuing need to provide new homes to meet the needs of the area, and the principle of supporting rural communities to remain strong and vital, it is not considered to be a reasonable option to reduce windfall development levels below those in the current plan.

Some local communities have indicated that they feel that the current policies restrict the potential for their communities to take any new development of even a limited nature. The Council therefore explored the approach to the scale of development at villages through the Issues & Options consultation.

The question was therefore whether there should be greater flexibility provided to allow larger developments and if so whether this should be:

- a similar approach to that currently in place, but with higher numbers, or
- by removing any numbers and applying criteria that look at each development proposal on its merits and having regard to the character of the village concerned.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

Options that could respond to the issues identified were:

- i. Retain the existing approach to the scale of any individual windfall scheme in villages (with the potential addition of Better Served Group Villages with, say, a limit of 20 dwellings on any individual scheme);
- ii. Retain numerical limits but increase the scale of any individual scheme allowed. For example (different levels could be chosen):
 - Minor Rural Centres could increase from 30 to 50

	<p> dwellings - Better Served Group Villages could be set at 30 dwellings - Group Villages could increase from 8 to 20 dwellings - Infill villages could increase from 2 to 10 dwellings </p> <p> iii. Remove numerical limits for Minor Rural Centres (and if they are added, also remove limits for Better Served Group Villages), so that along with Rural Centres, the most sustainable categories of settlement would have no limit on individual scheme sizes, having regard to village character. </p> <p> iv. Remove numerical limits on individual schemes for all categories of village and dealing with all proposals on their merits having regard to village character. </p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 14: What approach do you think the Local Plan should take for individual housing schemes within village frameworks on land not specially identified for housing:</p> <p> i. Retain existing numerical limits for individual schemes ii. Increase the size allowed for individual schemes. iii. Remove scheme size limits for Minor Rural Centres, and if included for Better Served Group Villages, so they are the </p>

	<p>same as Rural Centres</p> <p>iv. Remove scheme size limits for all categories of village</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Option i. Existing Approach - Would continue to restrict the scale of development in smaller villages, which indicates a positive impact for access to services, facilities and employment by focusing development into more accessible areas. By restricting the scale of development proposals in many villages, it could be restricting the use of previously developed land opportunities.</p> <p>Option ii. Increased Numbers – proposes to increase thresholds, allowing larger developments at minor rural centres, but also would result in potentially larger scale developments in smaller villages. This could have negative impacts on access to services, employment, and use of sustainable travel objectives, as services and facilities in these smaller villages are limited.</p> <p>Option iii. More Flexibility at larger villages - proposes a greater flexibility for minor rural centres and potentially better served group villages, retaining the higher limits from option ii in Group and Infill villages. Public transport services are limited in some of these villages, but they do have a range of basic services.</p> <p>Option iv. Remove Numerical limits for all categories - could enable significant scale of development in smaller villages, although this is mitigated by the requirement to have regard to village character. Providing greater flexibility in smaller villages does have greater potential to meet rural housing needs, and to make the most of opportunities to utilise previously developed land. Option would create significant potential for larger scales of development in more rural areas where there are limited public transport services, services and facilities. It therefore has potential for significant negative impact on objectives relating to access to services and facilities, access to employment, and sustainable travel.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Retain existing numerical limits for individual schemes (S:106 (18 PC), O: 22, C: 7)</p> <p>Increase the size allowed for individual schemes (S:27 (5 PC), O: 29, C: 1)</p> <p>Remove scheme size limits for Minor Rural Centres, and if included for Better Served Group Villages, so they are the same as Rural Centres (S:16, O: 13, C: 4)</p> <p>Remove scheme size limits for all categories of village (S:39, O: 12, C: 1)</p> <p>Please provide any comments (S: 1, O: 3, C: 38)</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 5: Over the next 20 years do you feel the plan should allow greater flexibility so villages are able to expand and would you support more development in proportion to the scale of the village where you live?</p>

	Total comments received: 703 (including 301 petitioners against further development in Comberton)
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Main views</p> <p>i) Retain existing numerical limits for individual schemes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works well so no reason to change. • Raising limits for villages other than Rural Centres risks unsustainable development. • Ideally reduce limits. • If local communities want more development can use Neighbourhood Plan – for local communities to decide. Could revise village frameworks. • Takes no account of availability of suitable sites within villages – inflexible. • Too restrictive for infill villages. <p>ii) Increase size allowed for individual schemes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some limited scope for relaxation – but must respect character of village. • Increased limits allows for more affordable housing. • Suggested increases too much – lead to uncontrollable development. <p>iii) Remove scheme size limits for Minor Rural Centres, and if included for Better Served Group Villages, so they are the same as Rural Centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater flexibility in larger villages – need to plan positively for growth. • Each scheme should be dealt with on merits having regard to village character and needs. • Would destroy character and amenities of these villages. Infrastructure cannot cope. Need to keep villages as villages. <p>iv) Remove scheme size limits for all categories of village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits take no account of availability of suitable development sites within villages, inflexible, unsound. • Artificial limits too restrictive. • No limits would give free rein to development. • Development should be of scale appropriate to scale of existing village. • Should leave to Parish Councils to decide – local issue. <p>Questionnaires: A range of comments were received opposed to development in villages (where more than 10) – Comberton (337), Bassingbourn (18), Fulbourn (15) Fen Ditton (11) Great Shelford (13), Sawston (10), Histon Impington (10), Guilden Morden. 90 representations refereed to specific villages being capable of accommodating modest development. 36 said modest development would be acceptable, 17 said no development.</p>
Preferred Approach and	Retail in scale limits in the Core Strategy DPD 2007 (option i)

Reasons	<p>The thresholds form an important element of the sustainable development strategy of the plan. There is a need to apply restrictions to development in smaller villages in order to restrict the scale of development taking place in the most unsustainable locations. However, thresholds still allow recycling of land and modest schemes to support local needs. In view of the continuing need to provide new homes to meet the needs of the area and the principle of supporting rural communities to remain strong and vital it is not considered a reasonable option to reduce development levels below those in the current plan.</p> <p>There was by far the greatest support for retaining the existing numerical limits although there was some support for increased thresholds or indeed removing threshold entirely.</p> <p>The existing thresholds provide a reasonable balance between allowing development, and avoiding unsustainable levels of growth in areas with limited access to services, facilities and employment by sustainable modes of travel.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy S/8: Rural Centres, Policy S/9: Minor Rural Centres, Policy S/10: Group Villages, Policy S/11: Infill Villages
Policy S/8: Rural Centres (and Paragraphs 2.51 to 2.54)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 23</p> <p>Cambourne: Support: 2 Object: 0 Cottenham: Support: 3 Object: 0 Great Shelford and Stapleford: Support: 1 Object: 0 Histon and Impington: Support: 2 Object: 2 Sawston: Support: 1 Object: 0</p> <p>Other Issues: Support: 4 Object: 8</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council / Gamlingay Parish Council – Supports inclusion of these villages. • Elsworth Parish Council - - Support existing approach to hierarchy development limits. • Sawston - provides many key facilities making it an ideal village for building essential and long overdue housing. • Cambourne – Support recognition Cambourne is a sustainable settlement. • Cottenham – Local facilities employment, transport, large vibrant village with capacity for further expansion. • Great Shelford – appropriately recognised as rural centre. • Histon and Impington – Meets criteria and is correctly identified.

	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – Reference to infrastructure should include drainage infrastructure. • Histon and Impington Parish Council - Policy should make clear that retail and commercial businesses serve a wider community than settlement itself. Should encourage small business premises. Developments should not be encouraged which will relocate employers away from rural centres. • Cottenham, Great Shelford, Histon and Impington – too few sites in Rural Centres to meet housing needs. Should allocate additional sites. H/1 favours sites at Minor Rural Centres. • Histon and Impington – Infrastructure cannot sustain additional development. • Add to policy that delivery of infrastructure should be demonstrated in detail with the planning application.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>There is general support for the villages being classified as Rural Centres.</p> <p>The Local Plan provides a focus on strategic scale development but with a proportion of sites at larger, better served villages. Of the 900 homes allocated at village sites 66% are at Rural Centres and 34% at Minor Rural Centres (to be done). A range of site options at both Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres were considered and consulted on during the Issues and Options process (and documented in the Sustainability Appraisal Audit Trail). The Local Plan includes the most appropriate and sustainable package of site allocations. The policy will also enable the recycling of land, through windfall development within these villages.</p> <p>The policy specifically requires the availability of infrastructure to serve development. A specific reference to drainage infrastructure is not required, as it is addressed by other policies in the plan.</p> <p>This section of the plan could do more to highlight the role of Rural Centres serving a rural hinterland with local services and facilities and employment. This is already acknowledged in paragraph 8.70.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Add to end of paragraph 2.52: <u>‘They perform a function in serving not only the population within the rural centre but also a rural hinterland of smaller villages.’</u></p>

Policy S/9: Minor Rural Centres

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy: S/8: Rural Centres

Policy S/9: Minor Rural Centres (and Paragraphs 2.55 to 2.57)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 298</p> <p>Bar Hill: Support: 1 Object: 0 Bassingbourn: Support: 0 Object: 2 Comberton: Support: 1 Object: 21 Fulbourn: Support: 31 Object: 3 Gamlingay: Support: 2 Object: 1 Girton: Support: 0 Object: 8 (plus petition of 22 signatures) Melbourn: Support: 201 Object: 3 Papworth Everard: Support: 1 Object: 0 Waterbeach: Support: 0 Object: 1 Willingham: Support: 1 Object: 0</p> <p>Other issues: Support 11 Object 10</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council – agree with selection of Minor Rural Centres • Elsworth Parish Council - Support existing approach to hierarchy development limits. • Fulbourn Parish Council – Support status as Minor Rural Centre. • Gamlingay Parish Council – Support status as Minor Rural Centre. • Papworth Everard Parish Council – Support status as Minor Rural Centre. • Bar Hill – support for identification as a Rural Centre. • Comberton – ideal for development. • Fulbourn – Support for classification as Minor Rural Centre. Reflects availability of facilities. • Melbourn – Support for Minor Rural Centre Status. • Willingham – appropriately placed recognising services and facilities. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council - The assessment is heavily weighted towards villages having a Village College, in part because of the facilities provided for the wider community. Unlike other village colleges, Bassingbourn Village College provides only very limited facilities for the wider community. Surrounding villages look to Royston not Bassingbourn as their centre. Other factors

	<p>do not provide an alternative justification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton Parish Council - Comberton lacks comparable infrastructure (current/potential) to support a Minor Rural Centre classification but it does as a 'better served Group Village'. Reclassification is superfluous since no practical sites to support further development within village framework. Majority of residents support no significant changes. • Girton Parish Council – Object to Minor Rural Centre status. Full-time Post Office now part-time. School at capacity. Infrastructure not available to support growth. • Comberton – Does not compare favourably with Minor Rural Centres. Lacks infrastructure. Village College is in Toft. No mains gas. No A road. No Sunday buses, Drainage issues. One small shop. More people travelling to find work. Development would harm rural character. Development larger than 8 dwellings unsustainable. No practical sites. Better described as a Better Served Group Village. Should focus development on large brownfield sites. • Fulbourn- object to downgrading of village. Has a good range of services and facilities. It is one of the largest and most sustainable villages in the South Cambridgeshire District. Good access to employment and education. There is no strategy to make the villages more sustainable. Sites rejected without consideration of affordable housing needs of village. • Gamlingay – Fulfils criteria to be a Rural Centre. • Girton – Object to minor rural centre status – does not perform a wider role as a service centre. GP not full time. Cashpoint is at garage. Not comparable with other villages. No scope for larger windfall development. • Melbourn – objection to Minor Rural Centre Status. • Waterbeach - should be reclassified as Rural Centre. sustainable settlement which is capable of accommodating new residential development. <p>Other Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn – Object to further development in Fulbourn. • Bassingbourn, Fulbourn, Gamlingay, Linton, Papworth Everard, Waterbeach – Too few sites allocated, not planning growth beyond existing commitments, will not meet affordable housing needs of villages. • Should allow development adjoining frameworks, as they are tightly drawn development is currently unlikely. • Thresholds are arbitrary. Should be based on ability to accommodate the individual development on its merits. • Should not be specific limits on scale. Should support other
--	---

	<p>issues e.g. accommodation for the elderly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figures should be referred to as an indicative guide rather than a limit. • Additional criteria should be added that larger developments are proposed Parish Councils should have to agree.
Assessment	<p>As detailed in the Village Classification report supporting the Local Plan, five settlements (Bassingbourn, Comberton, Girton, Milton and Swavesey) previously in the Group Village category stood out above existing Group villages, particularly due to the presence of employment, public transport, secondary education and proximity to Cambridge. They also performed better than some existing Minor Rural Centres. Rather than creating an additional category of village, these have been included as Minor Rural Centres. This prevents the hierarchy becoming too complex. The performance of the five villages against a consistent set of factors justifies their higher position in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Bassingbourn village college does provide services to the community, including a sports centre. Comberton benefits from the village college and a range of services and facilities bringing it above the standard of Group villages.</p> <p>Girton and Milton compare favourably in terms of services and facilities with three of the Minor Rural Centres. They have therefore been included in this category.</p> <p>The assessment carried out as part of the review of the hierarchy demonstrates that Fulbourn does not perform on a comparable level with the Rural Centres, and is more comparable with a number of Minor Rural Centres.</p> <p>Gamlingay, Melbourn and Waterbeach do not warrant Rural Centre status according to the assessment.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy S/10: Group Villages

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy: S/8: Rural Centres

Policy S/10: Group Villages (and Paragraph 2.58)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 73</p> <p>Barrington: Support: 13 Object: 0 Duxford: Support: 1 Object: 1 Fen Ditton: Support: 0 Object: 1 Fowlmere: Support: 1 Object: 0 Foxton: Support: 1 Object: 0 Great Abington: Support: 0 Object: 1 Hardwick: Support: 0 Object: 2 Highfields Caldecote: Support: 0 Object: 1 Longstanton: Support: 0 Object: 1 Meldreth: Support: 1 Object: 0 Orwell: Support: 1 Object: 0 Over: Support: 0 Object: 2 Whittlesford: Support: 0 Object: 1</p> <p>Other Issues: Support: 34 Object: 11</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council – agree with classification of Group villages. • Elsworth Parish Council – Support maintaining numerical limits. • Fowlmere Parish Council – Support policy. • Small scale development will benefit villages, appropriate to this scale of community. • Will protect character of small villages. • Support recognition of slightly larger developments on brownfield sites. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Abington Parish Council – Does not allow growth that the community wants. We have excellent services. Exception sites should not be the only way to facilitate development in Group villages like the Abingtons. (the Parish Council have proposed specific development sites, which are addressed in the Housing chapter) • Duxford – Scores the same as a number of Minor Rural Centres. Access to employment and rail services. Little prospect of tackling affordable housing need if remains as Group village.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fen Ditton – Should be a Rural Centre. Close to the City. There is a lack of development at villages. • Hardwick – Has existing facilities, and housing growth would provide additional facilities. • Longstanton – fails to take into account recent development, the guided bus, and Northstowe. • Over – Excellent range of services, short distance from the guided bus. • Whittlesford – Restrictions mean affordable housing need not being met. Good transport infrastructure. Village should be allowed to develop further. <p>Policy criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrington Parish Council – Support scale restriction, but object to lack of a cap on number of developments. Plan should specifically prevent housing development on Barrington Cement Works. • Should be more flexibility in policies for villages. • Barrington, Caldecote – Potential sites rejected. No assessment of capacity of villages to accommodate development. Will not meet affordable housing needs of village. • Fails to ensure village needs will be met. Will cause village decline. Does not reflect presumption in favour of sustainable development. • Could prevent efficient use of brownfield land. • Placing an arbitrary limit on the permitted size of development is unnecessary and restrictive. Sites should be considered on their merits. • Should allow development adjoining development frameworks where justified and without adverse impacts. • Scale should only be an indicative guide. • Direct conflict with NPPF, which acknowledges settlements in rural area often rely on each other for services and therefore do not individually contain a full range. • Should recognise sustainable group villages like Fowlmere, and remove or increase development limits.
Assessment	<p>A number of representations ask for villages to be upgraded in the settlement hierarchy. However, it is considered that the villages have been correctly classified as Group villages. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great and Little Abington - even when combined have a population only around 1300. The villages are separated by around 500m. There is a small village store and few other services and facilities. Both villages are correctly classified as Group villages. The Parish Councils' proposals for housing sites have been considered separately, in the housing chapter (Chapter 7), where changes are proposed to include these Parish-led

	<p>proposals in the plan given evidence of local support as part of the Council's approach to localism in the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duxford – The village has an hourly bus service, and very limited services and facilities. It would score well on the employment category due to the industrial area to the south of the village. However, overall the village does not merit a higher status. • Fen Ditton – a small village with limited services and facilities. Whilst it benefits from proximity to Cambridge the village itself is not comparable with the Minor Rural Centres and does not merit a higher status. • Hardwick - benefits from the bus service on the A428 corridor, but its range of other services and facilities is limited. It is not in the catchment area of Cambourne Village College and there are no scheduled bus services to Comberton Village College. There is no evidence submitted to suggest the delivery of 150 dwellings would be sufficient to deliver a new local centre. • Longstanton and Over – Only Northstowe is located on the Guided Busway. Like most villages along its route, these villages are some distance from the Guided Busway and are not generally in easy walking distance of the village Busway stop, although they would be within cycling distance. They also do not perform well in terms of the overall level of services and facilities. Using the consistent assessment approach, it is therefore not considered that the villages warrant a higher status despite being near to the Guided Busway. • Whittlesford / Whittlesford Bridge – Whittlesford Bridge is over 1km from the centre of Whittlesford, along a rural road. Apart from the railway station it has few services, and does not warrant a higher status. <p>The policy addresses the size of individual development schemes, rather than placing a cap on the total number of new dwellings in a particular village. National Planning Practice Guidance advises that plans should not place a blanket ban on development in villages. The policy enables the recycling of land on small sites, supporting the continued evolution of villages, but avoids large scale estate schemes which would create unsustainable scales of development. Alongside this policy the exceptions sites affordable housing policy (Policy H/10) will also support meeting local housing needs. The Strategy for the Rural Areas aims to provide an appropriate balance for South Cambridgeshire, and is compatible with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>There is sufficient flexibility in the policy to consider individual sites, but the removal of thresholds for development in small</p>
--	---

	<p>villages would not contribute to the sustainable development of the district.</p> <p>The principle of village frameworks is addressed by policy S/7. Introducing greater flexibility would undermine the sustainable development strategy being established through the plan, by loosening controls on the scale of development in rural areas. It could also undermine the delivery of affordable housing exception sites, which are important mechanism for meeting affordable housing needs in rural areas.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy S/11: Infill Villages

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy: S/8: Rural Centres

Policy S/11: Infill Villages (and Paragraph 2.59)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 24</p> <p>Babraham: Support: 1 Object: 0 Graveley: Support: 0 Object: 3 Heathfield: Support: 1 Object: 0 Ickleton: Support: 2 Object: 0 Kneesworth: Support: 1 Object: 2 Pampisford: Support: 0 Object: 1 Papworth St.Agnes: Support: 1 Object: 0 Wimpole: Support: 1 Object: 0</p> <p>Other Issues: Support: 9 Object: 2</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council – agree with infill status for Kneesworth. • Bourn Parish Council – agree with characterisation of Infill villages. • Elsworth Parish Council – Support maintaining numerical limits. • Ickleton Parish Council – agree with infill status for Ickleton. • Madingley Parish Council – Notes no proposed changes for the Parish. • Papworth Saint Agnes Parish Meeting – agree with status of Papworth St.Agnes. • Support for the Infill village policy. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graveley Parish Council – Small scale development proposed, which warrants an exception to policy (the Parish Council have proposed specific development sites, which are addressed in the Housing chapter). • Kneesworth – should be joined with Bassingbourn. Uses all Bassingbourn’s facilities. More sustainable than other infill villages. Would allow further development along the Causeway. • Placing an arbitrary limit on the permitted size of development may be unnecessarily restrictive. • Development framework boundaries around villages should be amended and the size of schemes reviewed so that

	<p>housing and affordable housing needs in the Infill Villages can be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility is lost in paragraph 2.59 which seems to suggest that development exceeding 8 dwellings will not be permitted. This is too prescriptive, inconsistent with Policy S/11 and unjustified.
Assessment	<p>The policy enables the recycling of land on small sites, supporting the continued evolution of villages, but avoids larger scale schemes which would create unsustainable scales of development in these very small villages with very limited services or facilities. Alongside this policy the exceptions sites policy for affordable housing (Policy H/10) will also support meeting local housing needs. The Strategy for the Rural Areas aims to provide an appropriate balance for South Cambridgeshire, and is compatible with the National Planning Policy Framework. There is sufficient flexibility in the policy to consider individual sites, but the removal of thresholds for development in small villages would not contribute to the sustainable development of the district, would not be well served by public transport, and would disproportionately add traffic onto Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire's already congested roads.</p> <p>One representation seeks for Bassingbourn and Kneesworth villages to be considered as one. Due to the distance and separation between the two this would not be appropriate, and Kneesworth should remain an Infill village.</p> <p>Site proposals by Graveley Parish Council have been considered separately, in the housing chapter as part of the Council's approach to localism and working with Parish Councils.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.59 appropriately reflects the policy, and does not need to be amended.</p> <p>A minor technical change is also proposed to include Streetly End in the policy. It is a very small village shown on the adopted and proposed Policies Maps as having a development framework but missing from the list of villages in the policy.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Include Streetly End in the list of Infill Villages.</p>

Policy S/12: Phasing, Delivery and Monitoring

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see also audit trail for Policy S/5: Provision of New Jobs and Homes

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 6	Providing a 5-year land supply
Key evidence	Annual Monitoring Report 2010 - 2011
Existing policies	No specific policy – addressed through Annual Monitoring Report
Analysis	<p>The NPPF carries forward the national requirement that Councils must identify and update annually a 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites. This is done through Annual Monitoring Reports. The NPPF also introduces a requirement to provide “an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land”. It goes on to say that “where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land” (paragraph 47). Issues for the Plan are therefore to ensure a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land is provided, and to consider whether the Council needs to demonstrate a buffer of 5% or 20% against its 5-year supply.</p> <p>It is fair to acknowledge that the Council has not had a 5-year housing land supply since the LDF was adopted. It was anticipated at the time of preparing the current strategy that the plan would not deliver the anticipated average annual rate in the first part of the plan period and that it would not be until the major sites came forward later in the plan period that the annual rate would be met and then exceeded to achieve the overall levels of housing development. The rate of completions very much reflected this anticipated trend although the major sites took a little longer to come forward than anticipated at the beginning of the plan making process but were building up to, and just before the recession exceeding, the necessary annual rates.</p> <p>It is therefore a matter of debate whether the Council can be regarded as having a record of “persistent under delivery”. The Council considers that comment is aimed particularly at Councils that failed to prepare plans to meet their local needs, not Councils such as South Cambridgeshire District Council who were amongst the first to embrace and prepare Local Development Frameworks</p>

	<p>and fully plan for their local needs. Whichever buffer is provided for, the Council recognises the importance of taking on board the lessons of implementing the current development strategy, particularly in difficult market conditions, and a key issue will be to provide sufficient flexibility in the range, size, type and location of housing allocations to provide a more robust strategy that can better withstand potentially changing market conditions.</p> <p>The amount of housing identified as deliverable over the following 5-years 2012 - 2017 in the last AMR is 5,606 dwellings. Amending the figures for Northstowe and removing North of Newmarket Road for consistency with the land supply approach in the issue above, this gives a supply of 4,746. This does not include any estimate for windfalls which would increase the supply if included.</p> <p>This compares with a 5-year requirement under the lower target option of 4,625, under the medium target option of 5,375 and under the high target option of 5,875 dwellings. A 5% buffer would be 231, 269, and 294 dwellings respectively. A 20% buffer, effectively an additional year, would be 925, 1075 and 1175 dwellings respectively. An issue for the plan will therefore be to ensure that the allocations in the new plan are capable of being delivered to ensure that the 5-year supply is met and that an appropriate level of buffer is provided that is flexible enough to be able to be brought forward from the later part of the plan period if monitoring of supply demonstrates that this is necessary. The NPPF does not suggest that the buffer is made up of additional allocations above the total target.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: To include a 5% or 20% buffer to ensure a 5-year housing land supply.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 6: What level of 5-year land supply buffer do you think the Council should plan for that would be capable of being brought forward from later in the plan period? i) 5% buffer; or ii) 20% buffer.
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Technical issue regarding land supply. Having a greater flexibility on 5 year land supply may provide greater flexibility to support delivery, but may not be necessary.
Representations Received	i. Support:58; Object: 5; Comment: 5 ii. Support:66; Object: 12; Comment: 3 Please provide any additional comments: Object: 1; Comment: 15

<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>i. 5% buffer</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Councils including: Papworth Everard, Gamlingay, Steeple Morden, Rampton, Great Shelford, Fowlmere, Grantchester, Great Abington, Litlington, Croydon, Over, Ickleton, Cambourne, Caxton, Histon & Impington– Support • South Cambridgeshire is not a 'persistent under deliverer'. When the present Local Plan was prepared it was anticipated that the level of completions would not meet the target 'until later in the plan period once the major developments came forward'. • Haslingfield Parish Council – This would allow local communities to propose development via Neighbourhood Plans • Any buffer will force development into villages and away from planned larger developments so the smaller the better. • Any slippage of delivery will be outside the control of the planning authority and can be addressed through plan, monitor and manage. • If market picks up substantially we may be able to reach the targets at the end of 5yr period. If we were entering from buoyant market then higher buffer would make sense. • A 20% buffer would be unsustainable. This is the equivalent to a Trumpington Meadows development size site being sought each year in addition to the low growth housing provision figure. • The rate of house building is currently low, so the Council should be able to demonstrate more than a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land. A 5% buffer is adequate. • A 20% buffer would be very challenging, if indeed possible, to achieve. • Should be covered by windfall supply. • A low level buffer is needed to ensure all sites are developed if possible and avoid uncertainty for those living next door to potential development sites. • A large buffer undermines the local planning processes <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow a 20% buffer given the number of recent development plan Inspectors' reports imposing buffers. Examples of measures to help identify a buffer include increases to the village framework and allocations for small-scale village development. • The buffer should be 20% to provide for flexibility in provision. • Between 2001 and 2011, the annual average of the plan target was only achieved in the year 2007/08. Due to this record of persistent under-delivery, the five year supply
---	---

should include an allowance for a 20% buffer.

COMMENTS:

- 5% is required. No more can be justified unless the character of the area is to change towards a suburban environment and the transport network cannot cope.

ii. 20% buffer

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

- SCDC has not met its annual average housing requirement since LDF was adopted, which must be described as "persistent under-delivery". A 20% buffer is necessary to front-load supply of land for housing and assist in boosting delivery of new homes (6 including Cambridgeshire County Council)
- A 20% buffer would support the vision to deliver impressive and sustainable economic growth and enable the Council to respond to changing market and economic conditions.
- **Cottenham Parish Council** – Much of this 20% can come from windfalls; such an approach will help the Council meet its targets.
- **Comberton Parish Council** – Support
- Low level of provision in recent years caused by slow progress of larger sites. Unlikely to change in short-term given economic situation
- The plan recognises the importance of providing sufficient flexibility to deal with choice and competition in the market over the plan period. Given recent development plan Inspectors imposing buffers, it is prudent to allow a 20% buffer at this stage of the plan-making process, rather than to create delays later in the process.
- The role of windfall development, in particular housing land, is emphasised in the NPPF (paragraph 48). There are examples of brownfield windfall sites in the District that can contribute to the housing land supply, such as CEMEX's site at Barrington. NPPF guidance is clear that larger sites can also be windfall, such as the former cement works at Barrington.

OBJECTIONS:

- **Fen Ditton Parish Council** – Disagree; under-delivery has all been down to delays to Northstowe.
- A 20% buffer is excessive and unnecessary in South Cambs.

COMMENTS:

- To be effective the 5-year land supply buffer must be consistent with the housing target over the plan period. The Local Plan should provide the high growth land supply buffer.

	<p>Please provide any comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council will need to argue a revised case for identifying a 5% or 20% buffer, and what these figures are likely to be. • Histon & Impington Parish Council - The carry-over of Impington 1 for housing and Histon 1 for commercial development from the last LDF into the new Local Plan needs confirmation. The houses that could be built on the remaining half of Impington 1 should be included in the calculation of the five year land supply. • Comment is difficult as Government guidance is so vague at present. Some suggested alterations seem to hold little prospect for improvement. Unless the profit element is scaled down, I do not see a point in worrying about land supply. • Giving over land to housing that may in fact not be needed, may sacrifice the need for land for food. • Caldecote Parish Council – A 10% to 15% buffer would be sensible. • Foxton Parish Council – No land should be brought forward to make up a shortfall. • With planned high housing growth - which may not materialise - the need is for 5%. Were the Council to go for low housing growth then the buffer should be 20%. • A sensible policy approach would be for the Council to allow a 20% buffer when calculating the five year supply, but reviewed annually and reduced to 5% where the housing target has been continually met over a five year period.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>The Council has continued to maintain up to date development plans and has a significant level of identified housing supply. The development strategy in the Local Development Framework 1999-2016 was always expected to deliver fewer than the annualised average number of homes in the first part of its plan period, with higher than the annualised average in the later years once construction started on the major developments which have longer lead-in periods. This strategy was beginning to be delivered when the recession hit in 2008 and progress on the major sites stalled temporarily. The severe slow-down in house building had the effect that in recent years the Council has not had a 5 year land supply against the Core Strategy 2007 target. This is particularly impacted by the reducing amount of the plan period to 2016 remaining. Under these circumstances the Council considers that the normal 5% buffer is the appropriate buffer for the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan with an end date of 2031.</p> <p>A 5-year supply of housing land, on the basis of the average annual figure of 950 homes required to meet the 19,000 housing requirement, is 4,750 homes. A 5% buffer would therefore be 238 homes capable of being brought forward from</p>

	<p>later in the plan period if needed.</p> <p>The plan will provide sufficient flexibility in the range, size, type and location of housing allocations to enable a 5-year land supply to be maintained. The Council has fully allocated its housing requirement (the housing trajectory shows that existing completions and commitments and new allocations could provide 19,289 homes in the plan period) and a number of the allocations could be brought forward in the plan period if needed, including the new village at Bourn Airfield. The Council has not relied on windfall sites even though it is confident that there will be a continuing supply of housing on such sites amounting to an average of 208 homes a year and therefore these houses make up the majority of a 5% buffer on their own. The trajectory shows that many years of the plan period exceed the annualised average without taking account of windfalls by an amount that covers part or all of the 5% buffer. However, windfalls will help to fully meet the 5% buffer in any periods where there is not sufficient surplus and will assist in those years where the 5-year supply is not met in full.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised: Histon & Impington Parish Council request confirmation of the status of existing allocations - Impington 1 and Histon 1 – and suggest that these sites could be included in the housing land supply. Development of the southern part of the allocation at land north of Impington Lane, Impington (referred to as Impington 1 in the Local Plan 2004 and Policy SP/6 in the Site Specific Policies DPD) has been completed. The Council has not had any indication from the landowner that the northern part of this site is available for development. It is also located in flood zone 3 therefore this allocation is not being carried forward. Histon 1 was allocated in the Local Plan 2004 for employment use, but this allocation was not carried forward into the adopted Local Development Framework. Much of the site previously identified is already in employment use.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy S/12: Phasing, Delivery and Monitoring
Policy S/12: Phasing, Delivery and Monitoring (and Paragraphs 2.60 to 2.67 and Figure 3 Housing Trajectory)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 64 Support: 4 Object: 60
Main Issues	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England - Monitoring indicators to assess the

	<p>effectiveness of Plan policies are welcomed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the need to delay Waterbeach to avoid adverse impact on delivery of Northstowe. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homes and Communities Agency - supports the phasing of new settlements (e.g. Bourn Airfield and Waterbeach Barracks) as set out in Policy S/12. Is important to ensure the timely delivery of new settlements and the continuous supply of housing. Is also essential to the successful delivery and establishment of each new settlement. Policy should be amended to encourage and support the early delivery of Northstowe as the first priority as each new settlement must be afforded the time to properly establish itself as a place where people choose to live. Delivery of new settlements in parallel with each other would have the potential to overwhelm the housing market and could compromise the delivery of future phases of individual new settlements. • Move forward trajectory of Waterbeach 1 year would mean no Green Belt development required. • Move Waterbeach forward therefore no need for Bourn Airfield new village. Plan identifies far more housing than the identified need. • Increase build rate of new settlements quicker to help deliver critical mass. • Bourn Airfield should not be held back unfairly and 5 years later than Cambourne West. • Waterbeach should be allowed to come forward 5 years earlier. • Policy should prioritise delivery of Northstowe. • Assumptions regarding delivery of new settlements are overoptimistic due to infrastructure requirements. • Northstowe trajectory is over optimistic, and anticipated delivery rate is too high. • Over reliance on a few large sites has contributed to shortfall. Proposed development strategy repeats this. • No positive planning to rely on windfalls. Uncertain that supply will continue. Only based on most recent five year period. SCDC now seeks to control development on garden land. • Contribution of windfalls could be higher than anticipated. • If windfalls were counted as the City Council has done, there would be an over supply, and no need to allocate greenbelt sites like Impington Lane. • South Cambs has a persistent record of under delivery. Economic downturn is no justification. Land supply buffer should be 20% rather than 5%.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to allocate more sites of a variety of scales in a variety of locations. • Action to bring forward previously developed land should be part of strategy, not a response to shortfalls. • Trajectory shows not enough housing until 2021. Boost needed now.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>A range of views has been received both that the trajectory is over optimistic and more sites need to be allocated to provide sufficient housing, including in the short term, and that a number of sites could come forward quicker than is anticipated. The promoters of Waterbeach new town and Bourn Airfield new village assert that their developments could come forward earlier than assumed in the housing trajectory and that they shouldn't be held back by the plan. The HCA supports the phased approach to delivery of the new settlements as part of a strategy that supports delivery at Northstowe becoming established before competing new settlements start to come forward.</p> <p>The Council has taken a robust approach to the housing trajectory, drawing on experience over a number of years of the delivery of housing in the district. The plan aims to provide a flexible and balanced approach that allocates the full housing target and make sensible assumptions on delivery. Experience of delivering new settlements at Cambourne and Northstowe demonstrate the longer lead-in times for these major developments and the trajectory is cautious on the assumptions for Northstowe, particularly as it will continue to be developed beyond the plan period and any over optimistic assumptions would leave the plan with an undersupply to 2031 if delivery falls below those levels. On the other hand, Northstowe is a key part of the development strategy and there is an impetus now gaining momentum for delivery to start on site and for delivery rates to build quickly and be sustained. The trajectory has been updated in the Annual Monitoring report based on a survey of promoters of individual developments to ensure the most robust assessments possible. For Northstowe, the promoters assume that once Northstowe is up and running it will deliver 500 homes per year on average throughout the rest of the plan period. The Council has taken a precautionary approach and assumed maximum delivery of 400 homes per annum. There are no controls in the plan on the rate of delivery of Northstowe so if it can deliver more there are no planning policy barriers to that, but it is not assumed for the reason given above.</p> <p>The timescales assumed for Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield take account of the Council's experience of delivering new settlements and are considered to be realistic. This is also part of a strategy to ensure that the new settlements do not all try to deliver at once.</p>

	<p>This could risk slowing the rate of delivery of these new developments by prolonging the time during which they are the least attractive developments on the market because they are not yet of a scale to provide the full range of services and facilities that are available in developments elsewhere. Once started, these sites need to deliver the necessary services and facilities on site and supporting infrastructure quickly, especially transport, to ensure that they become sustainable developments at an early stage. Again, as developments that will continue beyond 2031, it is important to be robust in the assumptions made on delivery. Bourn Airfield is also programmed to start delivering a year later than the Council considers it otherwise could, as part of a strategy to manage the delivery of housing and provide flexibility in the plan. The plan allows for both Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield to come forward earlier if needed to ensure a 5-year housing land supply. The HCA support for the phasing of the two additional new settlements is consistent with the Council's view.</p> <p>As addressed at Policy S/6: Strategy, the plan includes a range of types, sizes and locations of sites to provide a robust and flexible strategy but appropriately remains focused on larger more sustainable forms of development. This includes an element of village sites far beyond that in the adopted plan focused on the larger better served villages.</p> <p>The trajectory includes a robust allowance for windfalls that is supported by evidence and is consistent with the NPPF. Garden land cannot be included in the windfall allowance, but any planning permissions granted for development of garden land can subsequently be counted as part of housing supply. The Council has evidence of a consistent supply of windfalls over a long period of time, and despite challenges at previous local plans that supply will not continue at similar rates, it has continued to do so and there is no reason to suppose that will change over the plan period. The Council has allocated its housing target in full, without reliance on windfalls, but windfalls play a part in demonstrating an appropriate additional buffer as part of a 5-year housing land supply.</p> <p>The AMR demonstrates that there will be a full 5-year supply of housing land every year from submission through to 2031 with a surplus. This includes a buffer of 5% as required by the NPPF. The Council considers this is the correct buffer to apply. The NPPF requires a 20% buffer to be provided if there is evidence of persistent under delivery in an area. The Council does not consider this applies to South Cambridgeshire. Looking at past delivery for the current plan period 1999 to 2016 (see table below), the Council has met the annualised target applying in the</p>
--	--

	<p>adopted plan in operation at that time for four of the nine years up to the recession that took effect on housing delivery in 2008-2009 and had only a small shortfall of 40 homes for two further years. The remaining three years it had a shortfall of less than 200 homes again reflecting the effects of the economic cycle. The Council had met the annualised requirement for the three years leading up the recession and was showing good signs of continuing to deliver at the necessary levels to meet the Core Strategy target had it not been for the recession.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to test against the annualised Structure Plan or Regional Plan target for the whole of the current period, as not only had the higher order plans themselves not been adopted until part way through that period, but there was then an inevitable time lag until a local plan could be put in place to implement the housing target at the local level. This is particularly relevant in a district where the last round of higher order plans introduced a major step change in housing delivery, rising from an average of 753 per annum to 1,176 per annum, that then needed to put in place through allocations in local plans. This was done as expeditiously as possible, with adopted local development documents starting to come through from 2007, despite comprehensive changes to the plan making system at that time. Completion rates were rising well and had started to exceed the annualised target by 2008 but the major worldwide recession then took hold and delivery rates were halved in a year. Recovery has been slow nationally over the last few years but major sites, particularly most of the sites on the edge of Cambridge are now starting to deliver strongly with other sites actively at the planning stage. There is every sign of that continuing and Northstowe is soon to start on site. The plan therefore appropriately allows for a 5% buffer to ensure a continuous 5-year supply of housing land.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Note: Amendment arising in Chapter 7 (Policy H/1) to amend Figure 3: Housing Trajectory to change the predicted housing completions for Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston, from being delivered in 2017-2021 to being delivered in 2021-2025 in recognition of the pattern of leasehold interests on the site.</p>

Table: Housing completions compared with annualised target in adopted plan

	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Completions	801	801	525	653	979	571	877	924	1,274	610	611	656	671	587
Adopted Annual Target - Local Plan	843	843	843	843	843	753	753	753	1176	1176	1176	1176	1176	1176
Surplus / Deficit	-42	-42	-318	-190	136	-182	124	171	98	-566	-565	-520	-505	-589
	Local Plan 1993				Local Plan 2004			Core Strategy 2007						

Monitoring

Monitoring(Paragraphs 2.68 to 2.70 and Figure 4 Monitoring Indicators)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 4 Support: 0 Object: 4
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage - include an indicator to monitor success in protecting, and where possible, enhancing the historic environment. • Natural England - M20 should also consider changes in the condition of biodiversity sites. • RSPB - monitoring the effects of the Plan on internationally designated sites should seek to confirm that the amount affected by development (directly or indirectly) is nil. • Plan should seek independent assessment of large schemes to review their quality
Assessment	The Sustainability Appraisal which accompanies the plan proposes monitoring a number of Significant Effects indicators. Data is collected annually in the Annual Monitoring Report. This includes indicators relating to Listed Buildings and Heritage at Risk, and on the quality of biodiversity sites. They do not need to be repeated in the plan.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change