



# Report to South Cambridgeshire District Council

by **Cliff Hughes BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
Room 3/25 Hawk Wing  
Temple Quay House  
The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN  
☎ 0117 372 8566  
mail: [enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk)

date

11 October 2007

## **PLANNING & COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 (SECTION 20)**

## **REPORT OF THE EXAMINATION INTO THE CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE AREA ACTION PLAN**

Document submitted for Examination on 6 January 2006  
Examination hearings held 19-21 June 2007

## CONTENTS

|   | Page      |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Introduction</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>PROCEDURAL TESTS OF SOUNDNESS</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>TESTS OF CONFORMITY, COHERENCE,<br/>CONSISTENCY, AND EFFECTIVENESS</b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>THE PREFACE AND INTRODUCTION</b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>THE COVERAGE OF THE DPD</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>VISION AND DEVELOPMENT<br/>PRINCIPLES (CSF/1, CSF/2<br/>AND CONCEPT DIAGRAM)</b>                                     | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>THE SETTING OF THE CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE<br/>(CSF/4)</b>   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>ENHANCING LANDSCAPE, BIODIVERSITY, RECREATION AND PUBLIC<br/>ACCESS IN THE CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE<br/>(CSF/5)</b> | <b>12</b> |
| <b>THE STRUCTURE OF TRUMPINGTON WEST<br/>(CSF/6)</b>  | <b>15</b> |
| <b>HOUSING (CSF/7)</b>  | <b>16</b> |
| <b>TRANSPORT (CSF/10, CSF/11)</b>   | <b>18</b> |
| <b>BIODIVERSITY (CSF/15)</b>  | <b>20</b> |
| <b>COUNTRYSIDE RECREATION<br/>(CSF/18)</b>  | <b>20</b> |
| <b>AN INTEGRATED WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY<br/>(CSF/19)</b>   | <b>21</b> |
| <b>AN EXEMPLAR IN SUSTAINABILITY<br/>(CSF/21)</b>   | <b>22</b> |
| <b>WASTE (D13)</b>  | <b>23</b> |
| <b>DELIVERING THE CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE<br/>(SECTIONS E1-E3)</b>  | <b>23</b> |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>OTHER MATTERS</b>                                   | <b>25</b> |
| <b>OVERALL CONCLUSIONS</b>                             | <b>26</b> |
| <b>ANNEX A: PREFACE - THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LDF</b> | <b>27</b> |
| <b>ANNEX B: REPLACEMENT POLICY CSF/2</b>               | <b>32</b> |
| <b>ANNEX C: REPLACEMENT POLICY CSF/5</b>               | <b>33</b> |
| <b>ANNEX D: REVISED TEXT FOR GLOSSARY</b>              | <b>34</b> |

## **Introduction**

- i) The requirements of s20(5) of the 2004 Act fall into two parts:-
- a. whether the DPD satisfies the requirements of s19 and s24(1) of the 2004 Act;
  - b. whether the DPD is sound.
- iii) This report contains my assessment of the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (AAP) in terms of the above matters, along with my recommendations and the reasons for them, as required by section 20(7) of the 2004 Act.
- iv) My role is to consider the soundness of the submitted Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan. The examination of soundness proceeded on the basis of hearings and written examination of Main Matters which I identified before the commencement of hearings, and also of questions I posed in writing to the Council, which were copied to interested parties.
- v) In this report, the introduction is followed by consideration of soundness in accordance with the procedural tests. I then deal with the coverage of the AAP which, as submitted, appears to be attempting to control development outside the AAP area and outside South Cambridgeshire District. Next I examine the AAP on a topic by topic basis, reaching conclusions on soundness in relation to the particular elements of the plan which have given rise to issues concerning soundness. My overall conclusion is that the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan is sound provided it is changed in the ways I specify.
- vi) Various changes to the plan's policies which could be made were suggested at the hearings and in writing. However the examination is not an editing exercise and, other than the changes I recommend, the policy elements in question do not render the AAP unsound.
- vii) In making my binding recommendations, I have sought to achieve an efficient and pragmatic way of delivering the aims of the new LDF system, whilst ensuring that the final document is basically sound and avoiding any unnecessary delay. The latter point is of particular importance in the case of the Cambridge sub-Region in view of the considerable development pressures and the need to achieve a step change in housing delivery.
- viii) This AAP was one of the first DPDs to be submitted under the provisions of the 2004 Act. The Council had to interpret the legislation and initial Government and other advice during the preparation of this DPD; much has emerged during the preparation and during my examination. With more recent and emerging guidance, it would be likely to look somewhat different to the submitted version. It would not normally be expected that the consequence of an examination would be so many detailed changes. In large part, in the case of this document, these changes have arisen through the document lacking conciseness largely through repetition and the inclusion of too much detail. Since this is one of the first of such documents it may be looked upon as a 'template' or example to copy: it should not be. Whilst the document resulting from my recommendations is

sound, I have no doubt that if the Council were starting the process afresh, the document would look rather different.

## **PROCEDURAL TESTS OF SOUNDNESS**

### ***Test 1 - Consistency with Local Development Scheme***

1.1 The production of the Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP is identified in the Local Development Scheme (LDS) and the document has been prepared in accordance with the milestones in the LDS.

1.2 The LDS describes the role of the AAP as addressing issues arising from the development in Cambridge City of large scale housing, of a medical research park, an extension of Addenbrooke's hospital, and a new access road from the A1307 Hauxton Road. The AAP does address these issues and includes provisions for landscape, recreation and countryside access consequent upon the development in the City. It also has policies and proposals for the redevelopment of land south west of Trumpington, with associated landscape and countryside access provisions, as referred to in the LDS.

1.3 Since the submitted AAP is generally in accordance with the LDS, I am satisfied that this soundness test has been met.

### ***Test 2 - Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement and associated Regulations***

1.4 The Council has yet to produce a Statement of Community Involvement. In these circumstances, the Council must comply with the minimum requirements as set out in the Regulations and ensure that the community is able and encouraged to participate in the preparation process. I conclude that the AAP has met this soundness test. I am satisfied all parties were given the chance to comment.

1.6. Some changes to the AAP have been suggested by the Council as a result of representations at the submission stage and during the examination. These were open to comment and are taken into account in my consideration of the issues and soundness in terms of the other tests.

### **Test 3 - Sustainability Appraisal (SA)**

1.7. The Council undertook an extensive SA exercise which is described in the Final Environmental/Sustainability Report (Reference Document RD/Sub/160). The SA identifies policy alternatives and constraints affecting the generation of alternatives, such as government guidance. SA is required to do no more than assess reasonable options, an obligation which I consider has been fully fulfilled, and this test is met. I am satisfied that the changes which I recommend are either within the scope of the SA or have been subject to SA within the representations put to me.

## **TESTS OF CONFORMITY, COHERENCE, CONSISTENCY, AND EFFECTIVENESS**

### **THE PREFACE AND INTRODUCTION**

2.1 This part of the report is concerned with the first section of the DPD, which is a Preface to the Local Development Framework as a whole. It is repeated in each of the DPDs submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2006. It is thus unnecessarily repetitious and contains dated material, and is therefore not effective. The Preface as written would fail test iv of the tests of soundness as it would conflict with national planning policy.

2.2 The Council accepts that there is duplication between documents, but considers that there is a need for a short preface to each document and that the text of this should be up to date. A replacement text has been agreed with the Council. This includes a reference drawing the reader's attention to the Glossary of technical and other terms to be found at the back of the document – see my recommendation at paragraph 2.5 below.

2.3 Chapter A – the Introduction will need substantial changes to be sound. This is because it will need amendment to reflect other parts of the AAP as I recommend they be changed, and because the element dealing with the Proposals Map is inaccurate as far as an adopted DPD is concerned. The adopted Proposals Map is separate, and not part of the AAP. The submitted AAP must include a submission proposals map showing the changes which will result to the adopted proposals map if the DPD is adopted (Regulation 13[4]), and to that extent paragraph A.4 of the AAP was correct at submission: but it will not be at adoption. I set out the text of Chapter A in the recommendation below. If the changes are not made the AAP would be unsound on the basis of cohesion and consistency (test vi).

2.4 As well as reflecting the points made above, I have taken the opportunity to make the Introduction as succinct as possible, whilst meeting the objective of providing an introduction to the AAP. I have also introduced changes to remedy the unsound elements of this section of the plan discussed in the next section of this report. Finally paragraph A.3 updates the section by the inclusion of the Council's revised simpler approach to masterplanning.

#### *Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

### **2.5 The following changes are required to make the document sound:**

- i) Delete the present text of The Preface and replace with the text set out at Annex A.**
- ii) Delete the present text of the Introduction and replace with the following:  
A.1 A sustainable new urban extension to Cambridge is proposed at the Cambridge Southern Fringe. The urban extension crosses the South Cambridgeshire/Cambridge City boundary. Much of the built development lies within Cambridge City and is addressed in the Cambridge Local Plan,**

**which should be read alongside this AAP to give a full understanding of all inter-related proposals in the area. The AAP establishes an overall vision for that part of this new urban extension which lies within South Cambridgeshire including its relationship with Cambridge and its surrounding countryside setting. It identifies the site within South Cambridgeshire for approximately 600 dwellings and associated development at Trumpington West, in the parish of Haslingfield, as well as the off-site infra-structure needed to deliver and serve the urban extension as a whole. The AAP also sets out the policies and proposals for the countryside near to the development areas at Trumpington West and in Cambridge, including landscape, biodiversity and access proposals.**

**A.2 The AAP will form part of the Local Development Framework for South Cambridgeshire District. It needs to be read in conjunction with the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD, as well as with the Cambridge Local Plan.**

**A.3 A number of more detailed plans will be required for Trumpington West, ranging from the masterplan to design codes. The AAP requires:**

- **A masterplan to accompany the outline planning application showing the general disposition of development, roads, services, open space and landscaping within South Cambridgeshire which allows for development on adjoining land within Cambridge City.**
- **Design Guidance (incorporated in the masterplan and supplemented by a Design and Access Statement).**
- **Design Codes to set more detailed design criteria to create a clear identity for individual areas.**

**A.4 A number of strategies are also required as part of the implementation of development at the Cambridge Southern Fringe to ensure that it is a high quality sustainable development which meets the needs of its residents.**

### **THE COVERAGE OF THE DPD**

3.1 In a number of places, both in policies and in supporting text, the plan for the Southern Fringe purports to control development in the City of Cambridge, outside the area covered by the plan and outside South Cambridgeshire District. For example, Policy CSF/23, along with some other policies, says that planning permission for development at Trumpington West, Glebe Farm, Clay Farm, Showground, Addenbrooke's and The Bell School will include particular requirements to be secured by a planning obligation. Of the sites named, only Trumpington West is within the District and the AAP area.

3.2 The AAP cannot control development in the area of another local planning authority. Without changes, the DPD would be unsound because of a failure to comply with tests iv, vi and viii.

3.3 Changes are necessary to make the document sound. During the examination, possible approaches to changing the plan, and a number of possible changes, were canvassed.

3.4 The developments in Cambridge specified in Policy CSF/23 and other policies will have effects on the AAP area, and needs will arise from these developments which can be met in the area of the AAP. The AAP is a spatial plan, and the administrative boundary will not prevent cross-boundary needs and effects from arising. The large population increase in neighbouring parts of the City will lead to an increase in the need for countryside access and to possible effects on wildlife in the AAP area. New buildings in the City might affect the foraging areas of species living in the AAP area. Examples of visual effects and the impact on the setting of the City are given below in paragraph 3.10. There are references in the Sustainable Communities Plan, the draft East of England Plan, and the Structure Plan to the types of action which will be necessary because of large scale development on urban edges. One purpose of the AAP is to deal with the effects of such development in Cambridge.

3.5 The objectives of dealing with the effects of these schemes can be satisfied without purporting to impose planning obligations on them through the agency of the AAP policies. This can be achieved by setting out the proposals which it is intended to implement to meet needs and mitigate effects, provided that there is evidence that these proposals are realistic, particularly through the availability of resources.

3.6 There is such evidence in the case of this AAP. Not only is there support deriving from the sources identified in paragraph 3.4 above, but the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 includes, for example, policies for the urban extensions to enhance the setting of Cambridge, respect key views, develop a new landscape framework, and link open spaces and footpaths into the existing and wider network. The City Council is negotiating with developers to secure resources for the type of provision envisaged in the AAP policies. Also, where necessary, the relevant authorities have the requisite experience to achieve by negotiation the landscaping and other provision sought, bearing in mind the pattern of land ownership, and the powers available for example to fill in gaps in the rights of way network.

3.7 The Council has suggested another possible approach to changing the plan. This would see the relevant policies worded to indicate an intention on the part of the Council to ask Cambridge City Council, in its determination of applications for development in its area, to secure contributions to specified measures or proposals to be implemented in the AAP area. This is not a concise formulation for a policy, and is somewhat removed from a proposal for the use of land or the direct control of development. However, the inclusion in the reasoned justification of wording to show how the resources would be secured would be helpful in meeting tests vii and viii.

3.8 None of the changes I am introducing to the AAP would lead to the plan falling foul of test iii. All of the proposals affected by the changes are already part of the plan and therefore have been the subject of Sustainability Appraisal and

consultation. As the changes are scattered through the plan and are significant in number, further consultation has been undertaken with those who made representations on the plan.

3.9 The precise changes are set out in the succeeding sections of this report, because they occur in several parts of the document. If these changes are made, there will be no reason to refer to Circular 05/2005. In any case references to specific national policy do not add anything to DPDs.

3.10 With specific reference to the proposed clinical development associated with Addenbrooke's hospital in Cambridge, this would also have effects on land within the AAP. National policy does not except clinical development from the need to consider its impact, and this form of development should not be excluded from the references to work to be undertaken in the AAP to mitigate impacts. The clinical development is required primarily because of the large scale residential development the Sub-Region has to provide. Nevertheless it has an impact in its own right. The Addenbrooke's development area is near the City boundary with South Cambridgeshire, and the land safeguarded until after 2016 for clinical development and research uses adjoins the boundary. These proposals will have a visual impact on the rural area of the Southern Fringe in South Cambridgeshire. The clinical buildings could be up to 36m in height including flues, and some viewpoints of these sites are elevated.

3.11 Some of the AAP mitigation proposals will be required because of the residential rather than the clinical elements of the Addenbrooke's scheme, but this can be taken into consideration when any planning obligation is being negotiated.

### **VISION AND DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES (CSF/1, CSF/2 AND CONCEPT DIAGRAM)**

4.1 Policy CSF/1 deals with the Vision for the AAP as a whole, Policy CSF/2 with the principles guiding the development of Trumpington West and the improvement of the countryside nearby.

4.2 As far as Policy CSF/1 is concerned, its contents and those of supporting paragraph B.3 appear to be attempting to control development in Cambridge City. Item 1 of Policy CSF/2 and part of its reasoned justification suffer from the same deficiency. For reasons given above, these need to be changed.

4.3 Policy CSF/2 is a very lengthy policy and some of its elements are repeated elsewhere in the plan, especially in Policy CSF/6. Rationalisation of these Policies with other parts of the plan is necessary in order to meet the requirements of test iv, consistency with national policy. I have resolved the problem by deleting much of Policy CSF/6, because of the unnecessary duplication with Policy CSF/2, and shortening the latter Policy, parts of which are deleted and parts of which are more suitably located elsewhere in the AAP. That has provided the opportunity to bring some of the descriptive material supporting Policy CSF/6 into the reasoned justification of Policy CSF/2.

4.4 The many changes have been put forward on behalf of the Council in answer to a written question from me. One aim, in making these changes and dealing with material to be deleted, has been to ensure that the policies as a whole are comprehensive, and that important aspects of the policies are not lost. Other policies and paragraphs in the plan are changed in order to consolidate material, and these changes are noted at the appropriate points in this report, or in paragraph 4.8 below where this is more convenient.

4.5 There are further effects arising from the changes. One is to reduce the considerable number of policy references to green corridors and access to the countryside, again minimising repetition. The remaining references reflect the different purposes of green corridors and access proposals, which can lead to differing requirements and locations. Also removed is the apparent requirement, in part h of Policy CSF/2, to provide facilities which seem to meet the needs of existing residents rather than needs arising from the new development,.

4.6 I have made organisational changes to the amended Policy CSF/2 put forward by the Council, in order to create a more concise policy.

4.7 There are changes to the Concept Diagrams, mainly as a result of changes to policies and their reasoned justification. These changes are noted in the relevant parts of the report. Overall, the diagrams perform a useful function and supplement similar diagrams in the Cambridge Local Plan. The diagrams provide the user of the AAP with information at a glance, while possessing more flexibility than the Proposals Map. The diagrams show the District boundary and indicative proposals both in South Cambridgeshire and in the City. However the inclusion of a scale imparts a spurious sense of accuracy to the diagrams, and they need to be updated in respect of proposals for Trumpington.

4.8 Also, as a consequence of the changes to Policy CSF/2, Landscape Policies CSF/12 and CSF/14 should be widened to include landscape material from Policy CSF/2.

*Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

**4.9 The following changes are required to make the document sound:**

- i) Add the word "innovative" after "vibrant" in the first line of Policy CSF/1.**
- ii) Delete from Policy CSF/1 the words "within both South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City".**
- iii) Replace paragraph B.3 with "The Area Action Plan includes policies and proposals for landscape, biodiversity, access and recreation between Wandlebury Country Park/The Magog Down and the Cambridge City boundary. These are partly to mitigate the effects, and to meet the needs, of development in the City. The AAP will form the basis of the Council's comments on any planning applications to Cambridge City Council, requesting that the development should contribute towards the proposals arising from the impact of that development."**

- iv) Replace Policy CSF/2 as submitted with the revised Policy CSF/2 included as Annex B to this report.**
- v) Replace paragraph B.6 with "Before the Council can grant any planning permission for Trumpington West, it will need to ensure that the development will be delivered consistent with the principles set out in the AAP. A Strategic Masterplan will create the framework within which a quality environment can be achieved. Different levels and types of design guidance will be required at appropriate stages during the development to ensure the delivery of a high quality development."**
- vi) Replace paragraph B.7 with "Securing landscape, access and biodiversity improvements within South Cambridgeshire for development which will take place within Cambridge City will require that the District Council when it is consulted by the City Council on relevant planning applications requests conditions/Section 106 agreements for linked funding provisions."**
- vii) Amend the Concept Diagrams by deleting the scale and the reference to an enhanced Trumpington village centre.**
- viii) Amend part 1c of Policy CSF/12 to read "Take account of the historic character of the site and reinforce local landscape character of the Southern Fringe as a whole."**
- ix) Add the words "the green corridor along the River Cam," after "including" in part 2 of Policy CSF/14.**

### **THE SETTING OF THE CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE (CSF/4)**

#### *The Green Belt Boundary*

5.1 This Policy addresses "The Revised Cambridge Green Belt". The Green Belt must be altered to make way for the Trumpington West development. The development in turn is needed to meet the District's challenging housing requirement. The site is suitable for housing allocation because, as an urban extension to Cambridge, it is near the top of the sequence of types of site to be chosen for development according to Core Strategy and regional policy. It is centred on a substantial core of previously developed land, the former Monsanto complex, and can contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It is located adjacent to the Trumpington Park and Ride site and the proposed southern terminus of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway. Opportunities for development in the urban area of Cambridge have been fully considered. There are exceptional circumstances justifying an alteration to the Green Belt boundary. However the revision of the Green Belt within the District is to allow for development only at Trumpington, not for housing and other schemes in Cambridge City.

5.2 On present evidence, there are not exceptional circumstances for altering the Green Belt boundary to exclude from the Green Belt sites on the edge of Great Shelford. The Core Strategy DPD has found a shortage of housing land measured against the requirement, of 1000 dwellings. The examination of the Site Specific Policies DPD offers the opportunity to assess the suitability of sites to

make up the shortfall. There are many potential sites upon which this shortage could be made up. Great Shelford (with Stapleford) is a rural centre, but some of the potential housing sites elsewhere are large sites which are much better placed in the sequential approach to be used in the allocation of land.

5.3 From my site visits I conclude that the existing Green Belt boundary includes in the Green Belt land which is largely open, rather than developed. The Green Belt land forms part of the countryside by reason of its open nature and connections with other open land. The Green Belt boundary follows recognisable features like roads and the curtilages of housing areas. A relaxation of the Green Belt around Great Shelford would not accord with national policy or be justified by the evidence, and would not be the most appropriate response to the shortage of housing land.

#### *Policy CSF/4*

5.4 Part 2a of the Policy can have direct control over the impact of development at Trumpington West on the character and setting of Cambridge, but not over the impact of development in the City. In any case the actions and proposals to mitigate the effects of the latter development are provided for in other, detailed, policies of the AAP. In addition the supporting text dealing at some length with the Green Belt in the City suffers from similar objections and is also superfluous. It would be possible to reword part 2a of the Policy but other elements of part 2 suffer from unsoundness.

5.5 Clause 2b should be omitted because it effectively repeats part of the third purpose of the Cambridge Green Belt.

5.6 Again the first part of clause 2c adds little to the second purpose of the Cambridge Green Belt. The second part of the clause adds an additional purpose in effect, which is not justified by the evidence. It is the setting and character of Cambridge which is to be preserved and enhanced, not the setting and character of nearby villages. Where a village and nearby land are important to the setting of the City, they will be covered by the existing Green Belt provisions of the Core Strategy DPD and the Development Control Policies DPD. Clause 2c should be deleted.

5.7 The above changes are necessary to confer on the DPD soundness in relation to tests iv, vi, and viii, together with test vii in the case of clause 2c. However, they remove most of part 2 of the Policy, leaving little which is not already the province of the Core Strategy DPD, which sets out the purposes of the Green Belt, and the Development Control DPD, which provides for recreation and access in the Green Belt. Accordingly I conclude that part 2 of the Policy should be deleted as a whole, to avoid repetition and conform with test iv.

5.8 There is an addition to paragraph C2.2 to accommodate material lost in the revision of Policy CSF/2.

#### *Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

**5.9 The following changes are required to make the document sound:**

- i) **Replace Policy CSF/4 as submitted with "The Cambridge Green Belt is revised as shown on the Proposals Map to provide for development at Trumpington West."**
- ii) **Add a sentence to paragraph C2.2, to read "The Green Belt will ensure that Cambridge remains physically separate from surrounding villages especially the closest villages of Great Shelford, Stapleford, Little Shelford, and Hauxton, and maintain the character of Cambridge as a city surrounded by a necklace of villages."**
- iii) **Delete paragraphs C2.3 and C2.4.**

**ENHANCING LANDSCAPE, BIODIVERSITY, RECREATION AND PUBLIC ACCESS IN THE CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE (CSF/5)**

6.1 The concern of Policy CSF/5 is the enhancement of the countryside in the Southern Fringe.

*General Matters*

6.2 Policy CSF/5 is a very detailed policy but the detail results from the Council's work with other interested parties on such matters as the provision of a landscape framework for the Southern Fringe. I conclude that there is a robust evidence basis for the detail in the AAP, with particular exceptions identified below.

6.3 The Policy suffers from the flaws mentioned in paragraphs 3.1-3.9 above. Without change it would render the AAP unsound. The Policy can be made sound by restricting the requirement for a planning obligation in the first sub-paragraph to Trumpington West, in place of the Cambridge Southern Fringe as a whole, which would include developments in the City. This logically leads to a reversing of the order of the detailed elements of the Policy, so that those which would be implemented as a result of the Trumpington West development would come first, and those needed as a result of the developments in Cambridge City would follow. The supporting text could then explain how the latter elements would be achieved (see paragraphs 3.6 and 3.7 above). A corresponding alteration to the Proposals Map reference would be necessary.

6.4 For similar reasons to those discussed in the preceding paragraph, paragraph C3.5 should be amended to avoid giving the impression that the Council controls development at Addenbrooke's Hospital.

6.5 Policies CSF/5 and CSF/23 deal with very similar matters and this results in substantial repetition, contrary to the provisions of tests iv and vi. The Policies should be combined as a new policy CSF/5, re-titled "Countryside Enhancement Strategy", as it is such a strategy which is aimed for through the agency of this and other policies in the plan.

*Trumpington Country Park*

6.6 A country park is to be created south and west of the proposed development at Trumpington West, between the housing area and the River Cam. Although there are no bridleways on this land or on adjacent land at the moment,

it is appropriate that the opportunity be taken to provide bridleways to meet the needs of horse-riders living in the new housing. The County Council's Rights of Way Team has the necessary expertise to provide links to existing bridleways outside the proposed country park, even if the existing network is separated from the country park site by land which is not controlled by the developer or Councils. Extension of the rights of way network is under active consideration. There is robust evidence for part I of the Policy and for its supporting text, and in this respect the AAP meets test vii.

6.7 Main Matter 4 is also concerned with the country park in the valley of the River Cam. Notwithstanding the scale of open space land offered by the previous owners of the area, the Trumpington Meadows Land Company has offered a large amount of open space as part of its proposals for Trumpington, including a substantial country park. The open space content of the planning application for the Trumpington development is much greater than that required to serve the population of the development.

6.8 The AAP allocates a larger area for the country park than the Company has offered, by including more land to the north-east. The size and shape of the AAP allocation would allow for a better access for country park users from the northern part of the park to the southern, across the M11. However even without the land to the north-east there would in my judgement be sufficient width of land (about 28m) alongside the motorway to provide mounding and landscaping to give visual relief and some noise attenuation for those using an access alongside the M11.

6.9 Occupants of new housing in Trumpington West would not need to walk alongside the motorway to gain the overbridge. The north-eastern land is not needed to meet their requirements. It seems to me that, although there is some advantage for park users in including the land to the north-east in the country park, the inclusion of the land does not accord with national policy in Circular 05/2005. Also, bearing in mind the scale of open space provision forming part of the Trumpington West scheme, there are not sufficient advantages to be gained to justify the inclusion of the land.

6.10 This aspect of the country park allocation does not meet tests iv and vii. The AAP can be made sound by deleting the north-eastern land from the country park as shown on the Proposals Map and Concept Diagram, and by rewording Policy CSF/5 i.

#### *Geographical Coverage*

6.11 The area subject to Policy CSF/5 is indicated on the Proposals Map. This area is to form the general location within which a countryside strategy, partly to meet the needs and deal with the impacts of development in Cambridge, can be worked out. The area north-east of Great Shelford and Stapleford is located close to the City and is well placed to accommodate the types of proposals included in the Policy. The specific locations for landscaping, access improvements and other proposals are not yet known, but should not be constrained by the exclusion of particular sites.

6.12 On the other hand, the extension of the Policy CSF/5 area would involve the inclusion within it of land with a tenuous connection with the development areas in the Southern Fringe. As it is the needs and impacts of this development which are to be met and mitigated by the proposals the policy area should not be extended. Countryside enhancement as a general proposal is being pursued by means other than the AAP.

6.13 In respect of the area to be covered by the Policy, the AAP is sound in terms of tests vi and vii.

#### *Other Matters*

6.14 There is no longer provision for a Strategic Open Space requirement, in the Development Control Policies DPD. Accordingly references to requirements and provision of this type of open space should be deleted from the AAP. In section C3, this means the deletion of paragraph C3.10 and changes to paragraph C3.11.

6.15 Finally, the Council agrees that specifying the species of trees to be planted is not appropriate at the level of this AAP, and part a of Policy CSF/5 should be amended accordingly.

#### *Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

#### **6.16 The following changes are required to make the document sound:**

- i) Replace Policy CSF/5 as submitted with the revised Policy CSF/5 included as Annex C to this report.**
- ii) Replace the Policy reference to CSF/5i on Inset C of the Proposals Map to CSF/5 1a.**
- iii) Replace the Policy reference to CSF/5j-n on Inset C of the Proposals Map to CSF/5 1b-e.**
- iv) Replace the Policy reference to CSF/5a-h on Inset D of the Proposals Map to CSF/5 2a-h.**
- v) In paragraph C3.5, before the second sentence, add the words "The District Council expects that -----", and replace "will" in the third sentence with "should".**
- vi) Insert a new paragraph after the heading "Shelford Road/Cambridge Road to Babraham Road" and before paragraph C3.3, to read "The District Council will ask Cambridge City Council in its determination of applications for development in the Cambridge Southern Fringe, to secure contributions to the preparation of the Countryside Enhancement Strategy referred to in Policy CSF/5 2 above, and towards the countryside enhancement measures referred to in Policy CSF/5 2a-h."**
- vii) Delete paragraph C3.10.**
- viii) Replace the first sentence of paragraph C3.11 with "It will be important to ensure that the substantial population of the major new community of the Cambridge Southern Fringe has good access to the countryside."**
- ix) Amend the country park allocation on the Proposals Map, and the diagrammatic indication of the country park on the**

**Trumpington West Concept Diagram, to accord with that shown on Plan MM4.1 in examination document CSFMM4 – 1731.**

**THE STRUCTURE OF TRUMPINGTON WEST (CSF/6)**

7.1 Policy CSF/6 generally repeats material in Policy CSF/2 and other policies controlling development at Trumpington West. This repetition would contribute to a finding of unsoundness under test iv, and so the repetitive content should be deleted. Some of the elements found only in Policy CSF/6 can be moved into a revised Policy CSF/2 or into topic policies so as not to lose them. The majority of the supporting text for Policy CSF/6 can then be relocated to support Policy CSF/2.

7.2 There is one exception to what is said in the preceding paragraph, and that is parts 8-10 of Policy CSF/6. This material deals with the treatment of the edges of the development, in order to guide the design of the important boundaries between the new built-up area and the Green Belt, the River Cam valley, and the southern approaches to the City. There is no other policy suitable for this material, which contains more detailed provisions than Policy CSF/2. A shorter Policy CSF/6 will therefore remain in the AAP, but will need to be re-titled to reflect its narrower content. The corresponding paragraph of supporting text will be retained following the Policy.

7.3 Through Main Matter 4, part 9 of Policy CSF/6, dealing with the height of development fronting the River Cam, has been brought into question.

7.4 Development in the Cam valley south of Cambridge is low key in most locations but this is not the case with the former Monsanto complex. Here there are extensive glasshouses, large and small buildings, and other features. These are well seen, on rising ground, from the adjacent section of the Cam valley, the proposed country park. It is important to enhance this area, and the Trumpington West proposal offers the opportunity to do this.

7.5 At the same time this is a sensitive location and care will be required in the development of the western edge of Trumpington West facing the river. Even so, the specification in the Policy that development should be limited to 2 storeys in height is too prescriptive, and also limited in itself. There are many factors which should be taken into account in designing the edge of the development, and there are several possible ways of treating the edge to avoid dominating the valley and to achieve enhancement. The AAP is the framework within which a suitable design can be arrived at through more detailed work. No analysis has been carried out to show why a 2 storey limit should be imposed in the AAP.

7.6 The restriction means that the plan is unsound in that it lacks flexibility (test ix) and fails to adopt the most appropriate policy (test vii).

7.7 Factors which should be taken into account in designing the development edge were discussed at the relevant hearing, and I include them in the rewording

of this policy provision. Similar rewording of the supporting text and Concept Diagram is necessary and is given below.

*Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

**7.8 The following changes are required to make the document sound:**

- i) Delete Policy CSF/6 with the exception of parts 8-10.**
- ii) Replace the heading of Section D1, and the title of Policy CSF/6, with "The Design of the Edges of Trumpington West".**
- iii) Replace part 9 of Policy CSF/6 with "Development facing the River Cam will be required to respect the character of the valley, in terms of height, scale, massing, form, colour, layout and landscaping."**
- iv) Replace the second sentence of paragraph D1.4 with "Here development must acknowledge the sensitive nature of the River Cam corridor."**
- v) Replace the wording "Riverside development 2 storey" in the key to the Trumpington West Concept Diagram by the words "Sensitive riverside development."**
- vi) Insert paragraphs D1.1-D1.3 and D1.5-D1.6 into the supporting text for Policy CSF/2, after paragraph B.7, and renumber accordingly.**

**HOUSING (CSF/7)**

8.1 There is as yet no evidence base to justify either a particular level of affordable housing at Trumpington West or a particular house size mix, although work on these is under way in association with a planning application for the development.

8.2 There is no housing mix or affordable housing element in policy CSF/7, but an indicative mix of affordable housing is given in the reasoned justification. On large strategic sites the proposed mix of housing should reflect the proportions of households which require market or affordable housing. National guidance suggests that there should be a specific affordable housing element in this policy. Trumpington West is considerably smaller than Northstowe, but it is nevertheless a large strategic site, and for the sake of consistency the AAP housing policy should follow that in the adopted Northstowe AAP unless there are particular reasons for a difference.

8.3 The Development Control Policies DPD includes an affordable housing policy (HG/3) which, in brief, requires housing developments to include 40% or more of affordable housing. As a large site on the edge of Cambridge Trumpington West can be expected to give rise to particular circumstances which should be taken into account in assessing the level of affordable housing to be provided. The Policy in the Development Control Policies DPD should be the starting point for negotiations concerning the level, and then the circumstances affecting this particular site can be taken into account. The AAP Policy should say

this. If this is done then the supporting text will need to exclude the indicative mix and incorporate other changes to reflect the policy change.

8.4 The Development Control Policies DPD also contains a housing mix (by number of bedrooms) policy for market housing. This Policy, HG/2, incorporates a significant degree of flexibility which will allow the circumstances at Trumpington West to be taken into account in deciding on a housing mix. Therefore there is no need for the AAP to contain a corresponding policy or the mix specified in paragraph D2.7, which should be removed to avoid repetition. However, there are, again, specific circumstances operating at Trumpington West which should be referred to in the reasoned justification for the AAP to provide clarity and to reflect local distinctiveness.

8.5 The wording changes set out below were agreed at the examination. They are necessary to give conformity with tests iv, vi, vii and ix.

8.6 There also changes to Policy CSF/7 consequent upon the shortening of Policy CSF/2 discussed above. This will redirect the housing elements of Policy CSF/2 to the housing policy of the AAP.

#### *Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

#### **8.7 The following changes are required to make the document sound:**

- i) Add a new sub-section after part 1 of Policy CSF/7, to read "Trumpington West will be developed with a good mix of house types, sizes and tenures (including affordable housing) attractive to, and meeting the needs of, all ages and sectors of society including those with disabilities, and which is well designed and of a high quality."**
- ii) Amend the first part of CSF/7 2 to read "Trumpington West will provide housing which achieves an overall high density. A range of densities will be provided following a design-led approach, including higher densities -----".**
- iii) Add at the end of Policy CSF/7 a new sub-section, entitled "Affordable Housing:", to read: "The starting point for negotiations concerning the provision of affordable housing at Trumpington West will be Policy HG/3 of the Development Control Policies DPD. However, this is a major and complex development which has a wide variety of requirements covering infra-structure and services, and a balance may need to be struck between competing requirements, in the light of economic viability."**
- iv) Delete all of paragraph D2.8 after the words "district wide", and replace with "Policy HG/3 requires that 40% or more of the dwellings given planning permission should be affordable. The strategic developments are the key to addressing the affordable housing requirements of the area, and therefore Policy HG/3 will be the starting point for negotiations as the percentage of affordable housing in**

- Trumpington West. Contributions to off site provision will not be appropriate.”**
- v) Delete the first sentence of paragraph D2.9 and replace with “Trumpington West will be a new community and it is important that it achieves a balanced and sustainable community profile. In order to ensure this, it is important that the right tenure mix within the affordable housing is secured. The mix of affordable housing will be determined in response to identified needs at the time of development.”**
  - vi) Delete the final 2 sentences of paragraph D2.7 and replace with “Cambridge has its own housing mix and development plan, and these factors, together with any up to date Housing Market Assessment, should be taken into account in determining the housing mix for Trumpington West.”**

### **TRANSPORT (CSF/10, CSF/11)**

9.1 These 2 policies are concerned with road infra-structure and with alternative modes of transport to the car.

9.2 The Council has an inadequate evidence base to support part 5 of Policy CSF/10, which would prevent the occupation of any dwellings until the completion of the Addenbrookes Access Road. Furthermore, the first part of the Policy better expresses the objective of preventing a material worsening of conditions on Hauxton Road, to which Trumpington West would have access. There is no need for both parts of the Policy. Without alteration Policy CSF/10 would fail tests vii and iv.

9.3 Hauxton Road is congested in the morning peak, but the increases in queues, at least as a result of the initial phases of development at Trumpington West, will not be material, and works to mitigate impacts can be undertaken. The opening of phase 2 of the Addenbrookes Access Road will unlock the network, but there is no need for the occupation of houses at Trumpington West to await that event provided that the phased development does not increase congestion materially.

9.4 Part 1 of Policy CSF/10 should be amended to express the policy test succinctly and to make it clear that the development will be phased in order to see that the test is met. Part 5 will not then be necessary.

9.5 In order to avoid the appearance of trying to control development in the City, part 2 of the Policy, and paragraph D5.2, should both be changed.

9.6 Policy CSF/11 and its reasoned justification will need to be amended as a result of the consolidation and shortening of Policy CSF/2 (see paragraphs 4.3 and 4.9 above).

9.7 Trumpington West is a very sustainable site because of its proximity to the park and ride at Trumpington. It is important that the development maximises this advantage and ensures that all parts have good access to high quality public

transport, for reasons of conformity with national policy and to encourage the use of public transport. There is evidence which justifies the AAP's use of 400m as the walking distance to public transport, and use of this distance measurement is consistent with the Cambridge Local Plan. The design of the development can locate housing and pedestrian/cycle routes to achieve the distance in most cases. Where bus routes have to be extended or diverted in order to bring other housing areas within 400m of public transport, subsidies can be provided to operators where necessary. I conclude that part 2 of Policy CSF/11 is sound.

9.8 The second bullet point in paragraph D5.7 expands on the proposal in Policy CSF/11 to provide connections to surrounding villages for non-motorised modes. However it is highly specific as to distance and the many villages to be connected. There is no evidence that all of these villages will need to be connected to Trumpington West and vice-versa, or that all villages within a particular radius need to be connected. This part of the AAP fails test vii and should be deleted. The Policy provision would remain to form the basis for deciding, in the light of particular evidence brought forward in more detailed planning, which villages should be connected to Trumpington West by rights of way routes. On the other hand there is no need to change this part of the AAP to refer to horse riders, as these are adequately covered in Policy CSF/11.

*Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

**9.9 The following changes are required to make the document sound:**

- i) Delete part 5 of Policy CSF/10.**
- ii) Replace part 1 of Policy CSF/10 with "Planning permission for development at Trumpington West will not be granted until it has been demonstrated by the applicants that the effects of the development would be such that the morning peak traffic queuing between Shelford Road and the M11 would not be materially worse than conditions prevailing at the time of submission of the first planning application. The development will be phased to achieve this objective;"**
- iii) Replace part 2 of Policy CSF/10 with "The development will be served by two road accesses which will link onto Hauxton Road."**
- iv) Replace paragraph D5.2 with "At Trumpington West two accesses will be required linking onto Hauxton Road. Hauxton Road lies entirely within Cambridge City, but the development of Trumpington West will need to demonstrate that it can be properly served by two access points. The southern one will be aligned so that it will connect to the Hauxton Road/Addenbrooke's link road junction, which will lie in Cambridge City Council's area, in order to minimise delays on Hauxton Road."**
- v) Add at the beginning of Policy CSF/11 1 "Trumpington West will be highly accessible and permeable to all its residents on foot, by cycle and High Quality Public Transport, to support sustainable transport, recreation and health."**

- vi) Add to part 3 of Policy CSF/11, after the words "surrounding villages," the phrase "the open countryside".**
- vii) Add the words "Trumpington and" after "including" in the first bullet point in paragraph D5.7, and delete the second bullet point in this paragraph.**

### **BIODIVERSITY (CSF/15)**

10.1 Policy CSF/15 suffers particularly from the problem identified above in paragraph 3.1 *et seq.* It purports to require planning applications in Cambridge City to be accompanied by ecological surveys.

10.2 To avoid a conclusion that the AAP is unsound for this reason, the Policy needs to be changed. Trumpington West can still be covered by the Policy requirement as a large part of it is within the District. Sites in the City cannot, but the reasoned justification of the Policy should make it plain that the Council will request the City Council to impose a requirement for surveys to be undertaken. For the reasons given in paragraph 3.6 above, the proposals in the Policy, for example those for the encouragement and protection of wildlife, should remain in the Policy.

10.3 The connection of development areas to sites of biodiversity interest is the subject of part 4 of the Policy. The connections mentioned in part 4 are supported by the Green Infra-structure Strategy and the Biodiversity Strategy. Their inclusion in the Policy does not necessarily mean that they will be provided as part of the developments in the Southern Fringe, but allows for them to be provided using a variety of resources, including contributions from specific developments if the tests set out in national policy are met in the individual case.

#### *Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

#### **10.4 The following changes are required to make the document sound:**

- i) Replace part 1 of Policy CSF/15 with "Outline planning applications for development at Trumpington West will be accompanied by a comprehensive ecological survey of flora and fauna. This will include land bounded by the River Cam and Hauxton Road as far south as Hauxton Mill."**
- ii) Insert an additional paragraph after paragraph D7.4, to read "The District Council will ask Cambridge City Council, in its determination of applications for development at Addenbrooke's, Clay Farm, Showground and the Bell School, to secure a comprehensive ecological survey of flora and fauna. This will cover land bounded by the Cambridge City boundary, Babraham Road, Granhams Road, and the edge of the built-up area of Great Shelford."**

### **COUNTRYSIDE RECREATION (CSF/18)**

11.1 This Policy too appears to be attempting to control development in Cambridge City. To prevent the AAP from being found unsound, similar changes to those made to Policy CSF/15 and its supporting text are needed.

11.2 The approved Development Control Policies DPD does not include any requirement for Strategic Open Space, following the Inspectors' report conclusion that the requirement in the submitted DPD was not well founded. References to Strategic Open Space in this AAP should therefore be deleted.

*Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

**11.3 The following changes are required to make the document sound:**

- i) Replace Policy CSF/18 with "A strategy will be developed with reference to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan to link Trumpington West to the wider countryside through an enhanced network of rights of way including footpaths, cyclepaths and bridleways, the provision of which will be funded by planning obligations on the development."**
- ii) Delete all of paragraph D9.12 with the exception of the first sentence.**
- iii) Insert a new paragraph after paragraph D9.12, to read "The District Council will ask Cambridge City Council in its determination of applications for development at Glebe Farm, Clay Farm, Showground, Addenbrooke's and The Bell School Site, to secure a strategy to be developed with reference to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan to link the developments to the wider countryside through an enhanced network of rights of way including footpaths, cyclepaths and bridleways, to include land in South Cambridgeshire."**
- iv) Delete all of paragraph D9.13 after the words "Hauxton Mill".**
- v) Delete the footnote to Appendix 3.**

### **AN INTEGRATED WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (CSF/19).**

12.1 Policy CSF/19 deals with foul and surface water drainage, watercourses, and water conservation.

12.2 Substantial elements of Part 2 of Policy CSF/19 are unsound, because they are unenforceable and appear to duplicate other statutory duties (tests iv, vii and viii). The first element of the changed Part 2 below is worded to avoid the appearance of requiring provision of waste water treatment capacity and of capacity, in receiving watercourses, for treated water. This provision would be wholly or largely off-site, and it might not be possible for developers to provide this infrastructure directly. A policy expressed in a more general form would avoid the above problems and allow sufficient flexibility to overcome foul drainage problems.

12.3 The Cambridge Southern Fringe is located in the driest region of England and is intended to be an exemplar in sustainability. National policy in PPS1 supports the sustainable use of water resources, within the overall aim of the prudent use of resources. In the Green Alliance speech on 17 May 2006, Yvette Cooper MP expressed the desire to achieve up to 50% reductions on mains water use compared with conventional housing at Northstowe. Trumpington West is a substantially smaller development, but the direction of government policy is clear, and the opportunity to reduce water usage should be taken. A target for this reduction should be included in Policy CSF/19, as it is in the Northstowe AAP, in order to achieve consistency with national policy and between DPDs. The target discussed in relation to this AAP is 25%.

12.4 The repetition contained in the Policy should be removed in the interests of a concise plan: biodiversity, for example, is dealt with elsewhere.

*The Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

### **12.5 The following changes are required to make the document sound:**

- i) **Replace clause 2 of Policy CSF/19 with "Neither the development of Trumpington West as a whole, nor any phase of the development, will result in harm in the form of untreated sewage discharge or increased flood risk from treated waste water. Planning conditions (which may include 'Grampian' style conditions) will link the start and phased development of the new town to the availability of waste water treatment capacity and the capacity of receiving watercourses."**
- ii) **Delete from clause 5 of Policy CSF/19 the words "---- to ensure no adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity" and replace with "----- in order to achieve approximately a 25% reduction in mains water use compared with conventional housing".**

### **AN EXEMPLAR IN SUSTAINABILITY (CSF/21)**

13.1 The AAP aims to secure in Trumpington West projects which are exemplars of the use of the earth's resources. As a large new development Trumpington West provides the opportunity of a comprehensive approach to energy provision and use.

13.2 The national policy requirement to have regard to environmental, economic and social objectives underlies the plan as a whole. The Policy is concerned with environmental objectives but other elements of the AAP address economic and social issues. There is no need to include in Policy CSF/21 caveats regarding practicability or economic viability, for example, any more than there is in other of the various AAP policies which would impose costs on developers.

- 13.3 There is an increased emphasis in government policy on reducing carbon emissions. Amongst other things, this is expressed in PPS1 and in paragraph 9.4 of the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the East of England Plan. New residential development as well as other new development needs to contribute to minimising increases in carbon emissions. Sustainability can be enhanced by, for example, the location, massing and design of development at Trumpington West. The evidence base for this part of the AAP is entirely adequate, and matters have moved on since the AAP was submitted.
- 13.4 Policy CSF/21 does not specify which exemplar projects in sustainable development will be included in the development. This leaves open the possibility that some potential projects will not be pursued because of technical, cost or amenity difficulties which could not reasonably be overcome. This is a flexible approach.
- 13.5 This part of the plan is sound in terms of tests vii and ix. No changes to the document are necessary.

### **WASTE (D13)**

14.1 As paragraph D13.2 acknowledges, it is not the role of the AAP to include policies for waste. Waste policies are contained in the Structure Plan and the Waste Local Plan 2003. The County Council is preparing a Waste and Minerals LDF, which is progressing. As the Council concedes, Section D13 of this AAP is unnecessary. The plan would be more concise, and would not lose anything of value if the section were deleted. Without this change the plan would be unsound on the basis of tests iv, vi and vii.

*Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

#### **14.2 Delete section D13.**

### **DELIVERING THE CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE (SECTIONS E1-E3)**

15.1 Section E of the plan is intended to ensure the timely and satisfactory implementation of development and improvements in the Southern Fringe.

15.2 Several specific elements of Policy CSF/22 "Construction Strategy" have been called into question, under Main Matter 8 and via Inspector's questions. As a general comment, a number of the changes suggested below are justified in part for the sake of consistency with the approved Northstowe AAP (test vi).

15.3 The aim of Policy CSF/22 2 is to prevent construction traffic from causing disruption in the surrounding area, especially in Trumpington. Avoidance of impact is the objective. Policy wording which allows for a scheme to be submitted in order to achieve the objective would be less prescriptive, more concise, and in conformity with tests viii and ix. The rewording also avoids giving the impression of extending control into Cambridge City, a problem with the submitted Policy.

15.4 In similar vein, Part 7 of the Policy should refer to the imposition of planning conditions and to the aims of such conditions. This would be a more suitable planning policy than one which refers to the "Considerate Contractors Scheme". A similar change to part 3 of the Policy would clarify the method of implementation of that part.

15.5 In the light of the sensitive open countryside nature of the land in South Cambridgeshire adjoining the development areas in the City, and of the availability of alternative locations for haul roads, the provision in part 4 of the Policy that haul roads to serve the City developments should not be located in the countryside of the District is justified. As for requiring a temporary waste management facility, this can be done under the terms of part 1 of the Policy, which calls for a comprehensive construction strategy, and of Policy DP/6 of the Development Control Policies DPD, which deals with construction waste. Other policies will also secure the recycling of materials on site.

15.6 Setting a policy test to avoid any adverse impact is too onerous. A reasonable aim in part 5 of this policy is to minimise impacts.

15.7 As the Council points out, Policy CSF/23 effectively repeats countryside enhancement provisions already included in Policy CSF/5. Along with its reasoned justification, Policy CSF/23 is superfluous. It should be deleted to ensure conformity with test iv.

15.8 By virtue of Policy CSF/25, management strategies, to manage various aspects of the development, such as recreation and landscape, will be submitted to the local planning authority for adoption prior to the granting of planning permission. The requirement in Part 2 of the Policy for these strategies to demonstrate that they receive (sic) the full support of the local communities is too onerous. It gives those communities a power of veto over the development and conflicts, in particular, with test iv. Consultation requirements which are more moderate, but which retain the involvement of both the existing and emerging communities in the development of services, should replace those set out in Part 2.

15.9 I note that the whole of Chapter E2 is supporting text, and none of it amounts to policy. The very lengthy paragraph E2.5 is no more than an indicative list of what might need to be provided at Trumpington West, repeating many matters the subject of policies in the AAP. In view of the duplication and prescriptive detail which is contained in paragraph E2.5, I consider it unsound, on the basis of tests iv, vi and vii, and it should be deleted. The benefit ascribed to it by the Council and others is not sufficient to overcome my objection to it.

15.10 The Council accepts that section E3 requires updating, to accord with tests iv, vii and ix. The reference to the likely timetable for construction needs to reflect the developer's latest estimate of completion. Paragraph E3.5 should be deleted as it is out of date.

15.11 Paragraph E3.6 is concerned with the preparation of the housing trajectory and is not intended to be a policy governing the timing of planning permission.

Nevertheless it is important to achieve accuracy, particularly in this case where a planning application has been submitted and an approval might pre-date the approval of the AAP itself. The second part of the first bullet point should be deleted in order to avoid possible inaccuracy and to accord with test iv.

*Action Needed to Achieve Soundness*

**15.12 The following changes are required to make the document sound:**

- i) Replace the first 3 lines of Part 2 of Policy CSF/22 with "A scheme will be introduced to avoid construction vehicles travelling through Trumpington and villages in the locality and to ensure that any haul -----".**
- ii) Replace the first line of part 3 of Policy CSF/22 with "Planning conditions will be imposed to prevent construction traffic from accessing the site during-----".**
- iii) Replace the words "avoid any" in Part 5 of Policy CSF/22 with "minimise".**
- iv) Replace Part 7 of Policy CSF/22 with "Planning conditions will be imposed to minimise the adverse effects of construction activity on residential amenity and the environment."**
- v) Delete the section of the AAP, on page 105, entitled "Strategic Landscaping".**
- vi) Replace Part 2 of Policy CSF/25 with "Management strategies must build in provision for ongoing consultation with the existing and emerging communities, which must be involved in the development of services, facilities, landscape and infrastructure."**
- vii) Delete paragraph E2.5.**
- viii) Replace the final sentence of paragraph E3.1 with "There is no specific annual house building target for Trumpington West but development is expected to be substantially completed by 2015."**
- ix) Delete paragraph E3.5.**
- x) In the first bullet point in paragraph E3.6, delete the phrase "before which no planning permission could be granted for development."**

**OTHER MATTERS**

16.1 A number of changes are necessary as a result of queries I have directed to the Council and other parties.

16.2 Trumpington West, including the land in Cambridge, is to be a substantial development of 1200 dwellings. The scale is sufficient to justify the provision of small-scale B1 uses to provide local employment, in the light of national policy encouraging mixed uses. However the Council's suggested amended wording should be incorporated to reflect the cross-boundary nature of the site. Provision could be made in either the District or the City. On the other hand, the reference

in part 1 of Policy CSF/9 to the remainder of Trumpington, in addition to Trumpington West, is at best ambiguous. It gives rise to the suspicion that the developer of Trumpington West will be required to meet the existing needs of Trumpington for community and other facilities.

16.3 The Core Strategy has been adopted and its position in the development plan for the area should be acknowledged. New national policy gives rise to a need to delete an out of date reference in Appendix 1.

16.4 The Council should renumber sections, policies and paragraphs as necessary following the above recommendations. Incorrect references to regional policy throughout the AAP should be amended and references to RSS6 should be replaced with RPG6. On the other hand, changes to the way in which the Structure Plan is referred to are generally matters of editing.

16.5 Bearing in mind the Glossaries contained in the Council's approved DPDs, I queried whether it would be desirable to expand the Glossary to this document. The Council has responded, and I recommend that the Glossary be amended as shown in my recommendation below, and that a reference to the Glossary be placed within the Preface to guide readers at the outset to the place where technical and other terms are explained. I have already added this addition in my recommendation for the Preface.

#### *Action Needed To Achieve Soundness*

#### **16.6 The following changes should be made:**

- i) In objective C1/a, add "the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy DPD and" after "requirements of".**
- ii) In objective D2/a, add "the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy DPD and" after "guidelines set out in".**
- iii) In paragraph E4.8 delete "Structure Plan" and replace it with "Core Strategy".**
- iv) Add to Policy CSF/8 the words ", the location of which will be determined through detailed masterplanning."**
- v) Add a sentence to paragraph D3.2, to read "It will be for detailed masterplanning to determine whether the employment development necessary within Trumpington West as a whole is better located in the City or in South Cambridgeshire."**
- vi) Delete from part 1 of Policy CSF/9 the words "and the remainder of Trumpington".**
- vii) Delete from paragraph 7 of Appendix 1 the words "the maximum level permitted by PPG3".**
- viii) Make any necessary consequential amendments to achieve consecutive numbering throughout the document, and correct references to regional policy where necessary.**
- ix) Replace references to RSS6 with RPG6.**
- x) Modify the Glossary at the end of the document, to read as set out in Annex D to this report.**

**OVERALL CONCLUSIONS**

17.1 I conclude that, with the amendments which I recommend, the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan DPD satisfies the requirements of s20(5)(a) of the 2004 Act and the associated Regulations, and is sound in the context of s20(5)b of the 2004 Act.

*Cliff Hughes*

Inspector

## **ANNEX A**

### **PREFACE - THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LDF**

#### **WHAT IS A LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK?**

1.1 The Local Development Framework (LDF) for South Cambridgeshire will replace the existing Local Plan which was adopted in February 2004. It is being prepared under the new government legislation for development plans. The LDF comprises a number of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) that set out policies and proposals for the development and use of land in the district. The first DPDs cover the period to 2016. The LDF includes a vision for the future of South Cambridgeshire and objectives and targets, which developments must meet to secure that vision. Once adopted, planning applications and other decisions will be made in accordance with it.

1.2 The Local Development Framework:

- Takes account of national, regional and strategic planning policies;
- Identifies sites for, and requirements of, major development;
- Provides the framework of policies for assessing all planning applications;
- Enables infrastructure and service providers to bring forward their services when needed by new development;
- Enables the public to be fully involved in developing local policies and proposals.

1.3 The Local Development Framework forms part of the Development Plan for South Cambridgeshire. The Development Plan is made up of those plans which have been statutorily adopted and which cover the District. The composition of the current development plan is set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme. This document sets out how the Council will move from the previous to the current development plans system, and lists which local development documents are to be produced and when.

1.4 The East of England Regional Spatial Strategy will replace the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (generally referred to in this document as the Structure Plan) when it is published in its final form by the Secretary of State. A number of Structure Plan policies will be 'saved', and remain valid until at least 28 September 2007, under the transitional provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Whilst under the terms of the new plan making system the LDF must be in general conformity with RPG6, in the circumstances of the Cambridge Area it is also appropriate and consistent for the LDF to have regard to the policy requirements of the Structure Plan.

## **CONTEXT**

1.5 South Cambridgeshire is located centrally in the East of England region at the crossroads of the M11 / A14 roads and with direct rail access to London and to Stansted Airport. It is a largely rural district which surrounds the city of Cambridge and comprises over 100 villages, none currently larger than 8,000 persons. It is surrounded by a ring of market towns just beyond its borders, which are generally 10–15 miles from Cambridge. Together, Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire and the Market Towns form the Cambridge Sub-Region. South Cambridgeshire has long been a fast growing district and in 2003 had a population of over 130,000 persons (bigger than Cambridge itself) and has become home to many of the clusters of high technology research and development in the Cambridge Sub-Region.

1.6 The regional context is set out in the Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia (RPG6) which was approved in November 2000. It aims to focus a higher proportion of Cambridgeshire's growth into the Cambridge Sub-Region and proposes a sequential approach to the planning of development, with much of the development concentrated into and on the edge of Cambridge (subject to a review of the Cambridge Green Belt), including development in South Cambridgeshire, and into a new town beyond the outer boundary of the Green Belt.

1.7 The LDF will enable the step change in growth required in the Regional Spatial Strategy and Structure Plan, particularly in the rate of housing development. South Cambridgeshire will be experiencing an almost 40% increase in housing development between 1999 and 2016. In the past much of the housing development in the Cambridge area has been directed to the villages and towns beyond the city. Whilst there has been employment growth elsewhere, Cambridge has remained the dominant centre of employment. As demand has outstripped the supply of housing close to Cambridge, people have located further from Cambridge increasing commuter flows through the District. Most of the new development in the District (on sites not yet committed) will in future take place on the edge of Cambridge and in a new town near to Longstanton and Oakington, named Northstowe.

1.8 The national context is set out in Planning Policy Statements (the replacement to Planning Policy Guidance Notes), Circulars and other advice from Government. Whilst some of those national policies will require local interpretation, a great number do not. The Local Development Framework will not repeat that advice which must also be taken into account in determining planning applications.

## **COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

1.9 The Local Development Framework will be a key mechanism for delivering the South Cambridgeshire Community Strategy. All local authorities are required by the Local Government Act 2000 to "prepare a community strategy for promoting the economic, environmental and social

well-being of their areas and contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in the UK.”

1.10 The Strategy is the result of a partnership between the District and County Councils, working with the health services, the police, parish councils, the business and voluntary sectors. These groups have come together in the South Cambridgeshire Strategic Partnership to produce the Community Strategy. The Local Strategic Partnership will continue to develop a joint approach to the important issues, whenever possible, and will oversee the delivery of the Strategy. The Local Development Framework will be important in securing those parts of the Community Strategy which involve the development, or use of land and buildings.

1.11 The Community Strategy's vision is split into 6 aims as set out below:

- ACTIVE, SAFE AND HEALTHY COMMUNITIES where residents can play a full part in community life, with a structure of thriving voluntary and community organisations.
- BUILDING SUCCESSFUL NEW COMMUNITIES where large-scale developments have created attractive places with their own identity, supported by a range of quality services.
- A PROSPEROUS DISTRICT where jobs, skills and learning are developed and sustained to benefit everyone.
- GOOD ACCESS TO SERVICES for all sections of the community, including older people, children and families, through better transport links and improved local services.
- QUALITY HOMES FOR ALL with new affordable homes developed to meet local needs and assistance provided for those needing help.
- A HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT with better access to a more biodiverse countryside, which is protected and improved, and sustainable measures implemented, minimising waste and tackling climate change.

1.12 The Community Strategy is reviewed regularly and includes actions for the following 3 year period which focus on meeting key aspects of the vision taking priority at the time and reflecting potential opportunities. Some of these will relate to district wide policies contained in the LDF, including issues such as affordable housing. Others will relate to the major developments in the district, which are addressed in planning terms in Area Action Plans, and which are a key priority for many of the stakeholders and service providers involved in the Local Strategic Partnership.

## **RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES**

1.13 The Council has consulted all key stakeholders at three stages in the preparation of the DPDs and it is for them to advise the Council how their own strategies affect the South Cambs LDF. Where such information has been received, this has been taken into account in preparing the DPDs. Where organisations did not advise the Council of their delivery plans, it will be for Cambridgeshire Horizons, as the delivery vehicle for the Cambridge Sub-Region, to draw together the delivery plans for all aspects of the major developments as part of the negotiations on the planning obligations agreements.

## **CORNERSTONE OF SUSTAINABILITY**

1.14 The LDF aims to improve the overall quality of life for residents of South Cambridgeshire in a way which will also benefit future generations. Taking a sustainable approach to economic, social and environmental issues will be at the heart of the plan and will be closely related to the national strategy for sustainable development which has four objectives:

- Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;
- Effective protection and enhancement of the environment;
- Prudent use of natural resources; and
- Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

1.15 European Directive 2001/42/EC requires an 'environmental assessment' of plans and programmes prepared by public authorities that are likely to have a significant effect upon the environment. This process is commonly known as 'strategic environmental assessment' (SEA), and covers relevant plans and programmes whose formal preparation began after 21 July 2004. Among the documents to which this requirement will apply are land use plans that cover a wide area, such as the LDF.

1.16 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of all emerging Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents. As the draft guidance explaining this requirement makes clear, SA and SEA are similar processes that involve a comparable series of steps. If there is a difference between them, it lies in the fact that SEA focuses on environmental effects whereas SA is concerned with the full range of environmental, social and economic matters.

1.17 A Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report has been prepared, and been the subject of public participation. This highlights economic, social and environmental issues relevant to the area, and objectives to test the LDF against. A Sustainability Report, incorporating an 'Environmental Report' has been prepared to accompany each DPD.

1.18 A further requirement comes from the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC) which requires Assessment of plans or projects

affecting Natura 2000 sites. Natura 2000 is a Europe-wide network of sites of international importance for nature conservation. Ramsar sites support internationally important wetland habitats, and are also included in the Assessment in line with Government policy in PPS9. The DPD has been subject to a Screening Assessment which identifies the likely impacts of the DPD on a Natura 2000 site or Ramsar site, either alone or in combination with other projects or plans, and considers whether these impacts are likely to be significant. The sites assessed have been agreed with Natural England and include those within and outside the district where assessment is required because of their proximity to South Cambridgeshire and / or the nature of their conservation interest. The Assessment objectively concluded that the DPD is not likely to have any significant effects on any Natura 2000 or Ramsar sites. There is therefore no requirement to proceed to the next stage of an Appropriate Assessment.

## **COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

1.19 The Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP has been prepared following a programme of consultation and public participation. Consultation with the community on the future planning of South Cambridgeshire began at the end of 2001 with the publication of an Issues Report. In April 2004 the Council carried out an initial consultation with statutory bodies, as required under the new system of plan making, to ensure that it was aware at an early stage of any programmes and plans that would affect the LDF. This was followed in October 2004 by consultation on issues and options, which gave people the opportunity to comment on how the local planning authority should approach the preparation of a particular development plan document. The Issues and Options Reports focused on key issues for the DPDs and issues where there were choices to be made on the policy direction. A Preferred Options Report (pre-submission draft) of the DPD was published in June 2005 and was subject to a six-week long public participation period, allowing people to make representations to be considered by the Council.

1.20 The DPD was then submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2006, and made available for a further six-week consultation period. Representations received were considered at an independent Examination, conducted by Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State to consider the "soundness" of the plan. The independent Inspector subsequently produced a report, which was binding on the Council. Further information on the plan preparation process can be found on the Council's website: [www.scambs.gov.uk](http://www.scambs.gov.uk).

1.21 A Glossary of Technical and Other Terms is to be found at the back of this document.

## **ANNEX B:**

### **POLICY CSF/2 Development and Countryside Improvement Principles**

- 1. A Strategic Masterplan for Trumpington West will be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the granting of any planning permission to demonstrate that the development will integrate effectively with development in Cambridge City:**
  - a. The Masterplan will include Design Guidance, supplemented by a Design and Access Statement, setting out the general principles for good design for Trumpington West;**
  - b. Design Guides/Design Codes for each phase of development will be prepared as part of applications for the grant of approval for reserved matters.**

**Trumpington West will be developed:**

- 2. As a western extension of Trumpington of approximately 600 dwellings in South Cambridgeshire with appropriate employment, services, facilities and infra-structure.**
- 3. As an attractive feature in the landscape with which it is well integrated through a variety of edge treatments;**
- 4. As a compact and sustainable urban extension, well designed to a high quality, with a strong sense of local identity.**
- 5. With well designed and landscaped urban and residential areas which are accessible to Trumpington, permeable and legible, and which create neighbourhoods with their own character;**
- 6. With locally available community facilities to meet day to day needs either on site or elsewhere in the Cambridge Southern Fringe (within or outside the District);**
- 7. As a balanced, viable and socially inclusive community where people can live in a healthy and safe environment and have access to most of their learning needs;**
- 8. With a flexible design, energy efficient, built to be an exemplar of sustainable living with low carbon and greenhouse gas emissions and able to accommodate the impacts of climate change;**
- 9. To achieve a net increase in biodiversity across the site;**
- 10. Making drainage water features an integral part of the design of the urban extension and its open spaces, so they also provide for amenity, landscape, biodiversity and recreation.**
- 11. Trumpington West will be bounded by the Cambridge Green Belt which will constrain further growth.**
- 12. Trumpington West will connect the green spaces of Cambridge to the surrounding countryside, maintain a Green Corridor along the River Cam, and provide landscape, biodiversity and public access enhancements in the surrounding countryside.**

## **ANNEX C: REPLACEMENT POLICY CSF/5**

### **POLICY CSF/5 Countryside Enhancement Strategy**

**1. Planning permission for development at Trumpington West will include a planning obligation requirement for contributions to the implementation of a Countryside Enhancement Strategy which will create an enhanced gateway into the City between Hauxton Road and the River Cam and which will comprise:**

- a. The creation of a country park, comprising new meadow grassland, to the east of the River Cam, both north and south of the M11, from Grantchester Road to Hauxton Mill;**
- b. Hedgerow planting on field boundaries in the agricultural land between Hauxton Road and the Trumpington Meadows Country Park;**
- c. New footpaths, cyclepaths and bridleways creating routes through the area from Hauxton Mill and linking to Grantchester Road;**
- d. Measures to protect and enhance wildlife habitats, including managing public access to the river banks;**
- e. Noise attenuation on the northern side of the M11 through the creation of new landscape features which are compatible with the river valley character.**

**2. A Countryside Enhancement Strategy will be prepared for the area bounded by the Cambridge City boundary, Babraham Road, Haverhill Road, and the edge of the built up area of Great Shelford and Stapleford. The Strategy will comprise:**

- a. New copses on suitable knolls, hilltops and scarp tops.**
- b. Management and creation of chalk grassland.**
- c. Management of existing shelter belts.**
- d. New mixed woodland and shelter belts.**
- e. Creation of a landscape corridor along Hobson's Brook.**
- f. Reinforcement and planting of new hedgerows.**
- g. Roadside planting.**
- h. New footpaths, cyclepaths and bridleways creating routes through the area and linking to Wandlebury Country Park/The Magog Down.**

**3. The Countryside Strategies will include integrated proposals for landscape, biodiversity, recreation and public access improvements which will be compatible with long term agricultural production to create enhanced gateways into the City. Provision will be made for maintenance of landscaping and replacement of diseased, dying and dead stock for a period of 10 years, and details of long-term management thereafter.**

## **ANNEX D:**

### **REVISED TEXT FOR GLOSSARY**

|     |                          |   |
|-----|--------------------------|---|
|     | Above Ordnance Datum     | The Ordnance Datum is the mean sea level at Newlyn in Cornwall calculated between 1915 and 1921, taken as a reference point for the height data on Ordnance Survey maps.  |
|     | Affordable Housing       | A wide variety of types and tenures of housing where the common feature is that it is subsidised in some way to make it affordable to those who cannot afford a home on the open market.  |
| AMR | Annual Monitoring Report | An annual report monitoring the LDF's performance against a number of national and local indicators.  |
| AAP | Area Action Plan         | A Development Plan Document setting out policy and proposals for a specific area.   |
|     | Biodiversity             | Biodiversity is a term used to describe the richness of the living environment around us. It is the variety of life in all its forms, including richness of species, complexity of ecosystems and genetic variation.  |
| BAP | Biodiversity Action Plan | Encouraging a wide range of fauna and flora in a locality.  |
|     | Biophysical              | Biophysics is an interdisciplinary field which applies techniques from the physical sciences to understanding biological structure and function. The subject lies at the borders of biology, physics, chemistry, mathematics, engineering, genetics, physiology and medicine.   |
|     | Biotechnology            | The application of science and engineering to the direct or indirect use of living organisms, or parts or products of living organisms, in their natural or modified forms.   |
|     | Brownfield land          | Previously developed land (PDL) which is or was occupied by a permanent structure (excluding agricultural or forestry buildings), and associated with fixed surface infrastructure. The definition covers the curtilage of development. Previously developed land can occur in both urban and rural settings. The precise definition can be found in PPS3.                              |
|     | Building Regulations     | Building Regulations ensure the health and safety of people in and around buildings by providing functional requirements for building design and construction. They also promote energy efficiency in buildings and contribute to meeting the needs of disabled people. Builders and developers are required by law to obtain building control approval - an independent check that the |

|      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
|      |  | Building Regulations have been complied with. There are two types of building control providers - the Local Authority and Approved Inspectors.   |
| BIS  | Bus Information Strategy                       | Part of the Local Transport Plan.  |
|      | Cambridge Area                                 | The area covered by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.  |
|      | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan | Statutory plan that sets out broad development requirements in the County to 2016 (Prepared by the County Council).  |
| CGB  | Cambridgeshire Guided Busway                   | Proposed bus-based Rapid Transit System to operate along the former St. Ives railway line. See Rapid Transit System.   |
|      | Cambridgeshire Horizons                        | Cambridgeshire Horizons is the local delivery vehicle established by the Cambridgeshire local authorities to drive forward the development of new communities and infrastructure in the Cambridge Sub-Region in a sustainable way, in accordance with the approved planning policies.  |
|      | Cambridge Sub-Region                           | Comprises Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire and the Market Towns.  |
|      | Car Pooling                                    | Shared use of a car(s) by a group of people.   |
| CiWS | City Wildlife Site                             | Sites designated of particular local importance for nature conservation by Cambridge City Council and the Wildlife Trust.  |
|      | Climate Proofing                               | Climate proofing aims to ensure buildings and associated infrastructure are capable of enduring the future impacts of climate change, for example minimising risk of flooding, minimising risk of subsidence, installing water saving measures and devices, and using materials that have low / zero CO <sub>2</sub> and green house gas emissions.                        |
|      | Cluster  | Clusters are defined as concentrations of companies in related activities, specialised suppliers, service providers and institutions, which are co-operating, collaborating and competing to build competitive advantage often across sector boundaries (EEDA Regional Economic Strategy 2001). Clusters may be concentrated in a particular location or linked locations. |
| CPZ  | Controlled Parking Zone                        | An area in which special parking controls are applied.   |
|      | Community facilities                           | Facilities, which help meet the varied needs of the residents for health, educational and public services as well as social, cultural and religious activities.  |
|      | Community Strategy                             | Strategy for promoting the economic, environmental and social well-being of the area and contributing to the achievement of District Wide sustainable development.   |
|      | Comparison shopping                            | Goods that are purchased occasionally and for longer term use, such as electrical goods, clothing, household goods, books, jewellery, furniture etc. which consumers   |

|     |                                |  |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|
|     |                                | will compare before making a choice.   |
|     | Concept Plan                   | Shows in diagrammatic form the structure and the distribution of the main land uses and their inter-relationships within the new development.  |
|     | Conservation Area              | Areas identified by the Council, which have 'special architectural or historic interest', which makes them worth protecting and improving.   |
|     | Conservation Area Appraisals   | Produced by the Council covering various Conservation Areas within the district. The appraisals define the special character and evolve guidelines for development and enhancement schemes.  |
|     | Considerate Contractors Scheme | Requires that all contractors, sub contractors, suppliers and others working on a project minimise disturbance on neighbouring uses.   |
|     | Convenience shopping           | Goods that are purchased regularly and for immediate consumption, such as foods, drink, groceries, confectionary, tobacco, newspapers for which convenience is a prime consideration.  |
|     | Core Strategy                  | An element of planning policy within the LDF.  |
|     | Countryside Enhancement Areas  | Areas that have potential for undisturbed enjoyment of the countryside and for their landscapes and habitats to be significantly enhanced.   |
|     | Country Park                   | An area of countryside which is landscaped and managed for informal recreation and includes some visitor facilities such as car parking, toilets and an interpretation centre.   |
| CWS | County Wildlife Site           | Sites identified as being of particular local importance for nature conservation at county, rather than at national level  |
|     | Definitive Map                 | A legal record of the public's rights of way. The maps are produced by the Local Authority (Cambridgeshire County Council). Note there may be additional rights over land, which have not yet been recorded on the map or there may be rights, which are incorrectly recorded on the map.  |
|     | Design and Access Statement    | A statement submitted alongside a planning application by the applicant to demonstrate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• proper consideration has been given to the impact of the proposal and account taken of all relevant factors in the design and landscaping of the scheme</li> <li>• development will be accessible to everybody regardless of age, gender or disability.</li> </ul> |
|     | Design Code                    | Will guide the nature, scale and form of new development.  |
|     | Design Guide                   | Identifies the particular character of an area and sets out the general principles for good design.  |
|     | Development Brief              | Describes how proposals for a site will be implemented.  |

|         |  |  |
|---------|--|--|
|         | Development Framework                    | Line on the Proposals Map defining where policies for the built-up areas of settlements give way to policies for the countryside.  |
| DPD     | Development Plan Document                | Statutory document having been through Independent Examination.  |
| dph     | Dwellings per hectare                    | At least 30 in most circumstances, as required by PPS3: Housing.   |
| EEDA    | East of England Development Agency       |  |
| EERA    | East of England Regional Assembly        |  |
| EA      | Environment Agency                       |  |
| EIA     | Environmental Impact Assessment          | Considers the potential environmental effects of land use change, enabling decisions on land use change to be taken with full knowledge of the likely environmental consequences.  |
| EiP     | Examination in Public                    | Inquiry led by an independent Planning Inspector into proposals for and objections to LDDs.  |
|         | Farm diversification                     | Where a farm diversifies into non-agricultural activities.   |
| FRA     | Flood Risk Assessment                    | An assessment of impact of development on flooding, including the run-off implications of proposals.   |
|         | Flood Zones                              | Zones identified by the Environment Agency to indicate the risk of flooding.   |
| GPDO    | General Permitted Development Order      | Provides permitted development rights which allow certain types of development to proceed without the need for a planning application.   |
|         | Good local public transport service      | Minimum service frequencies of every 30 minutes during the day, hourly in the evenings and on Saturdays. Every 2 hours or better on Sundays.   |
| GO-East | Government Office for the Eastern Region |  |
|         | Grampian condition                       | Planning condition restricting development unless and until an event had occurred which was not within the power of the applicant to bring about. (Grampian Regional Council v. Aberdeen DC (1984) JPL 590 H.L).   |
|         | Green Belt                               | A statutory designation made for the purposes of: checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, preventing neighbouring towns from merging into each other, assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, preserving the setting and special character of historic towns and assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. |
|         | Green Corridor                           | Areas of open land which penetrate into an urban area for amenity and recreation.  |
|         | Green Fingers                            | As Green Corridors, but on a smaller scale.  |
|         | Green Separation                         | An area of open land required to keep apart two separate communities and maintain their individual   |

|      |                                 |  |  |
|------|---------------------------------|--|--|
|      |                                 |  | identities.  |
|      | Greenfield land                 |  | Land which has not previously been developed or which has returned to greenfield status over time.   |
|      | Greenhouse Gases                |  | Carbon Dioxide and other emissions, causing global warming.  |
|      | Greywater                       |  | The mildly polluted wastewater from shower / bath, washbasin and washing machine.  |
| HIA  | Health Impact Assessment        |  | An assessment of the impact of the proposed development on health and identifies actions that can enhance positive effects and reduce or eliminate negative effects.   |
| HSA  | Health and Safety Executive     |  | The Health and Safety Executive is responsible for health and safety regulation in Great Britain.  |
|      | High Quality Agricultural Land  |  | Land designated as Grades 1, 2 and 3a on the Agricultural Land Classification maps produced by Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.   |
| HQPT | High Quality Public Transport   |  | Generally service frequencies of at least a 10 minutes peak / 20 minutes inter-peak. Weekday evening frequencies of ½ hourly until 11pm, Saturday ½ hourly 7am - 6pm, then hourly and Sunday hourly 8am - 11pm. Also provides high quality low floor / easy access buses, air conditioning, prepaid / electronic ticketing, Real Time information and branding to encourage patronage. |
|      | Home Zone                       |  | Roads / neighbourhoods that are designed not just to allow the passage of motor vehicles, but so that all road users, pedestrians and cyclists as well as drivers can share the road space. Streets will be safer, greener, friendlier and more attractive, encouraging both social interaction and child's play to be part of the normal use of the street.                           |
|      | Housing Association             |  | Sometimes referred to as a Registered Social Landlord; a non profit making organisation which provides housing for people in need.   |
| HNS  | Housing Needs Survey            |  | Assessment of housing needs across the whole district.   |
|      | Housing Trajectory              |  | Assessments showing past, and estimating future, housing performance. They should consider past rates of housing completions and conversions and projected completions and conversions to the end of the specified framework period or ten years from the adoption of the relevant development plan document.  |
|      | Important Countryside Frontages |  | Land with a strong countryside character that penetrates or sweeps into the villages or separates two parts of the built-up area. Such land enhances the setting, character and appearance of the village by retaining the sense of connection between the village and its rural origins and surroundings.   |
|      | Infrastructure                  |  | Basic structure of systems such as utilities (gas, electricity, water) drainage, flood defences, transportation, roads, healthcare, education and other  |

|       |  |  |
|-------|--|--|
|       |  | community facilities.  |
|       | Infrastructure Partnership                       | Responsible for co-ordination of the delivery of housing and infrastructure across the Cambridge Sub-Region. See: Cambridgeshire Horizons  |
|       | Intermediate housing                             | Housing for those who do not qualify for social rented housing, but whose incomes are such in relation to local housing costs that they are nonetheless not able to access market housing. This includes intermediate rented and low cost home ownership.        |
|       | Intermediate rented housing                      | Rents are not to exceed 30% of net median household incomes in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire taken as a whole except where provided for specific groups of workers, where they should not exceed 30% of the net median income for the specific group.       |
|       | Key Diagram                                      | Illustrates the broad strategy for the area in a diagrammatic format.  |
|       | Key Worker Housing                               | Discounted market housing targeted at specific groups, including teachers, nurses and others whose role relates to the care and comfort of the community or sustaining the local economy, and who are unable to meet their housing needs on the open market.     |
|       | Landscape Character Assessment                   | Assessment of the landscapes, wildlife and natural features into distinct Landscape Character Areas.   |
|       | Landscape Statement                              | A statement submitted alongside a planning application by the applicant to demonstrate that they have properly considered the impact of their proposal on the particular site and surroundings.  |
|       | Legible  | A legible place is one whose landmarks or pathways are easily identified; a place that can be easily understood and which people can navigate simply and safely.   |
|       | Lifetime mobility standard / lifetime homes      | Developed by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation to provide dwellings that cater for the needs of residents throughout their lifetime, including the possibility of impaired mobility. These standards exceed the requirements of the Building Regulations.           |
|       | Listed Building                                  | A building or structure of special architectural or historic interest and included in a list, approved by the Secretary of State. The owner must get Listed Building Consent to carry out alterations, which would affect its character.                         |
| LAP   | Local Area for Play                              | A small area of unsupervised open space specifically designated for young children for play activities close to where they live. The target user is mainly for 4-6 year olds, although they can attract other children in slightly older and younger age groups. |
| LAPC  | Local Authority Pollution Control                |  |
| LAPPC | Local Authority Pollution Prevention and Control |  |

|      |                              |  |
|------|------------------------------|--|
|      | Local Centre                 | Smaller scale than a District Centre, and includes a primary school, provides for the day-to day shopping needs of local residents for convenience shopping and service provision, and small-scale local employment.   |
| LDD  | Local Development Document   | Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs).   |
| LDF  | Local Development Framework  | A "folder" containing LDDs, LDS, SCI etc.  |
| LDS  | Local Development Scheme     | Sets out the LDDs to be produced over the next 3 years.  |
| LEAP | Local Equipped Area for Play | Mainly for accompanied children from 4 to 8 although consideration is given to the needs of supervised children from 4 years, and unaccompanied children older than 8.   |
| LNR  | Local Nature Reserve         | Reserves with wildlife or geological features that are of special interests locally.   |
| LPA  | Local Planning Authority     | e.g. South Cambridgeshire District Council.  |
| LSP  | Local Strategic Partnership  | Public service providers, local communities, voluntary, public and private sectors co-ordinate improvements in public services to achieve sustainable economic, social and physical regeneration.  |
| LTP  | Local Transport Plan         | Sets out transport strategy for Cambridgeshire.  |
|      | Long Term Transport Strategy | Sets out the longer term transport strategy for Cambridgeshire to 2021.  |
|      | Low cost home ownership      | Including shared ownership, equity share, and discounted market housing. Costs (mortgage and any rent) are not to exceed 30% of gross median household incomes in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire taken as a whole except where provided for specific groups of workers, where they should not exceed 30% of the gross median household income for that specific group. |
|      | Material consideration       | Something, which should be taken into account when making planning decisions such as determining planning applications.  |
| MOD  | Ministry of Defence          |  |
|      | Mixed-use development        | Development comprising two or more uses as part of the same scheme. This could apply at a variety of scales from individual buildings to an urban extension. Mixed-use development can help create vitality and diversity and can help to reduce the need to travel, which is more sustainable.  |
|      | Monitoring Strategy          | Sets out how the LDF will be monitored against a number of indicators.   |
| MUGA | Multi-Use Games Area         | Used for ball rebound sports such as tennis, netball, basketball, and five-a-side football, hockey, lacrosse and general sports, training and play depending upon the surface material.  |
| NNR  | National Nature Reserve      | Protect the important areas of wildlife habitat and  |

|      |  |            |  |
|------|--|------------|--|
|      |  |            | geological formations.   |
|      | Natural Areas                          |            | Natural Areas are identified by a unique combination of physical attributes such as geology, plant and animal species, land-use and culture.   |
| NEAP | Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play   |            | Unsupervised site servicing a substantial residential area, equipped mainly for older children but with opportunities for play for younger children. Equipment will be similar to that of LEAP's but on a larger scale and may well include facilities for teenagers.                            |
|      | Open Space Standards                   |            | The amount of open space required as part of new development.  |
|      | Parish Plan                            |            | A vision of how a town or village should be, addressing social, economic or environmental issues.  |
|      | Park and Ride                          |            | A system where private motorists are encouraged to leave their car at an out of centre public car park and travel the rest of the way to their destination by public transport.  |
|      | Parking standards                      |            | Maximum permissible levels of car parking for various use-classes, along with minimum levels of cycle parking.   |
|      | Permeable                              |            | A permeable place is one which is based on the idea of linked streets and spaces, and which provides high levels of accessibility without long detours.  |
|      | Photovoltaic Energy                    |            | Solar energy from photovoltaic cells.  |
|      | Planning Condition                     |            | Requirement attached to a planning permission. It may control how the development is carried out, or the way it is used in the future. It may require further information to be provided to the Council before or during the construction.   |
|      | Planning Obligation                    |            | A binding legal agreement requiring a developer or landowner to provide or contribute towards facilities, infrastructure or other measures, in order for planning permission to be granted. Planning Obligations are normally secured under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. |
| PPG  | Planning Guidance                      | Policy     | National planning guidance.  |
| PPS  | Planning Statement                     | Policy     | New form of national planning guidance replacing PPGs.   |
| PPC  | Pollution Control                      | Prevention |  |
| PDL  | Previously developed land              |            | See brownfield land.   |
| PENs | Previously Established New Settlements |            | e.g. Bar Hill.   |
|      | Proposals Map                          |            | Map, which is part of the LDF showing all designations and site allocations.   |
| PVAA | Protected Amenity Area                 | Village    | Open land protected for its contribution to the character of the village.  |

|       |                                      |   |
|-------|--------------------------------------|---|
|       | Public Art                           | Publicly sited works of art, which make an important contribution to the character and visual quality of the development and community at large and is accessible to the public.  |
| RWH   | Rainwater Harvesting                 | Using rainwater for flushing toilets, etc.  |
|       | Rapid Transit System                 | Rail or bus transit service operating completely separate from any other modes of transportation (fully or partially) on an exclusive right of way.   |
| RTBI  | Real Time Bus Information            | A display in the bus shelter showing how long until the next bus arrives.   |
| RPG   | Regional Planning Guidance           | Planning guidance for the region (See RSS).   |
| RSS   | Regional Spatial Strategy            | New name for RPG.   |
| RSL   | Registered Social Landlord           | An organisation registered by the Housing Corporation to provide Affordable Housing.  |
|       | Research and development             | The investigation, design and development of an idea, concept, material, component, instrument, machine, product or process, up to and including production for testing (not mass production), where the work routine requires daily discussion and action on the part of laboratory and design staff.  |
|       | Research establishments / institutes | Provide accommodation for organisations whose primary purpose is to research or investigate ideas, theories and concepts, and / or to design and develop instruments, processes or products, up to and including production for testing, but excluding manufacture.   |
|       | Resource Re-use and Recycling Scheme | Promotes waste minimisation, and maximises opportunities for re-use and recycling of materials.   |
|       | Right of Way                         | A route over which the public has a right to pass and re-pass, including; Footpath (for use on foot only), Bridleway (for use by horses, pedal cycle or on foot), Byway (for use by motor vehicles, horses, pedal cycle or on foot). Public footpaths are not to be confused with highway footways, which are pavements to the side of the road. Public rights of way are legally recorded on the Definitive Map. |
| ROWIP | Rights of Way Improvement Plan       | Statutory plan required by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 which will support improvements to the rights of way network.   |
|       | Rural Enterprise                     | An enterprise where a countryside location is necessary and acceptable, which contributes to the rural economy, and / or promotes recreation in and the enjoyment of the countryside. Examples may include types of farm diversification, recreation and tourism.   |
|       | Safeguarded land                     | Land identified to meet longer-term development needs, beyond the plan period.  |
|       | Safer Routes to School               | Making the environment safer so that children can walk, cycle or use public transport to and  |

|      |                                     |  |
|------|-------------------------------------|--|
|      |                                     | from school as opposed to being carried in the car.  |
|      | Scheduled Ancient Monument          | Archaeological sites, buried deposits or structures of national importance by virtue of their historic, architectural, traditional or archaeological interest.   |
| S106 | Section 106                         | Planning agreements that secure contributions (in cash or in kind) to the infrastructure and services necessary to facilitate proposed developments.   |
|      | Sequential approach                 | A sequential approach to site selection and the planning of development encouraging a more sustainable pattern of living, with much of the development concentrated into and on the edge of Cambridge and at a new town. |
| SSSI | Site of Special Scientific Interest | Designated site of national importance to wildlife and / or geology.   |
|      | Social rented housing               | Housing provided at below market rents at levels controlled by the Housing Corporation, normally provided by Registered Social Landlords (Housing Associations).   |
| SIP  | Space for Imaginative Play          |  |
|      | Spatial Masterplan                  | Describes how proposals for a site will be implemented. The level of detail required in a spatial masterplan will vary according to the scale at which the masterplan is produced.                                       |
| SAC  | Special Areas of Conservation       | Designated site of international importance to wildlife and / or geology.  |
| SPA  | Special Protection Areas            | Designated site of international importance to wildlife and / or geology.  |
| SAP  | Standard Assessment Procedure       | Assessment procedure for energy rating of dwellings.   |
| SCI  | Statement of Community Involvement  | Shows how the wider community and stakeholders are to be involved in the process of producing a LDF.   |
| SEA  | Strategic Environmental Assessment  | Integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans, promoting sustainable development.   |
|      | Sui-generis                         | Those uses not allocated to a particular Use Class. See Use Class Order.   |
| SPD  | Supplementary Planning Document     | Informal policy which has been the subject of public participation (the new name for SPG).   |
| SPG  | Supplementary Planning Guidance     | See SPD.   |
|      | Supported housing                   | Is a generic term used to include supported housing for all client groups covered by the Supporting People Strategy (including people with physical or other disabilities) who cannot afford to buy or rent on the open  |

|       |                              |  |
|-------|------------------------------|--|
|       |                              | market.  |
| SA    | Sustainability Appraisal     | An appraisal against sustainability criteria of proposals for LDDs by independent consultants.   |
|       | Sustainable Development      | Development that meets the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.   |
| SuDS  | Sustainable Drainage Systems | Control surface water run-off by mimicking natural drainage processes and may take the form of swales, lagoons, permeable paving, green roofs and sensitively re-engineered channels or reed beds.   |
| TA    | Transport Assessment         | Assessment of the potential transport impacts of a proposed development, with an agreed plan to reduce or mitigate any adverse consequences and where appropriate establish how more sustainable modes of travel can be increased.   |
| TP    | Travel Plan                  | Package of measures tailored to a particular site, aimed at promoting more sustainable travel choices (such as walking, cycling, public transport) and reducing car use. It may include initiatives such as car sharing schemes, provision of cycle facilities, improved bus services, and restricting or charging for car parking.  |
|       | Traveller & Gypsy            | Circular 01/2006 defines this as persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling show people or circus people travelling together as such. |
| UCS   | Urban Capacity Study         | Assessment of vacant land within built-up areas which could be developed.  |
|       | Urban Design                 | The complex relationships between all the elements of built and unbuilt space.   |
|       | Urban extension              | Development built on the edge of an existing town or city which extends the built area of the settlement.  |
|       | Use Classes Order            | The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) established Use Classes, which is a system of classifying uses of land.  |
| B1(a) | Use Class B1(a)              | An office other than within Use Class A2.  |
| B1(b) | Use Class B1(b)              | Research and development, studios, laboratories, high technology.  |
| B1(c) | Use Class B1(c)              | Light Industry.  |
| B2    | Use Class B2                 | General Industry.  |
| B8    | Use Class B8                 | Wholesale warehouse, distribution centres and repositories.  |
| C2    | Use Class C2                 | Hospitals, nursing homes.  |
| D1    | Use Class D1                 | Places of worship, public halls, health centres, educational uses, libraries.  |

|     |                          |   |
|-----|--------------------------|---|
| VDS | Village Design Statement | Produced by communities to show what kind of development they want as part of their settlement.   |
|     | Windfall site            | A site which becomes unexpectedly available for development (usually for housing) during the Plan period and which is not already identified as a potential development site. |