

CHAPTER 5: DEVELOPMENT NEEDS IN CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
QUESTION / PARAGRAPH	
Paragraph 5.1  Support:3 Object: 3 Comment: 0	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Community needs it.</li> <li><b>Fenland District Council</b> - FDC agrees with the statement that "if the jobs come [to Cambridge] without new homes, there will be longer commuting and more congestion on our roads". With this statement in mind, it will be essential that the two districts of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire prepare plans which, collectively, meet their objectively assessed need for housing, with such housing met in locations in accordance with your identified sequential approach. Where, following the outcome of the sequential approach, housing is directed to market towns, it will be essential that appropriate infrastructure and opportunities for job growth are identified, delivered and monitored carefully.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The infrastructure is not set up for additional housing and the local amenities are overstretched.</li> <li>The Councils' evidence base is still being formalised with no up-to-date assessment of housing needs and requirements and other needs yet to be finalised and released to inform the current consultation. This is not an appropriate basis for strategic planning and does not conform to the NPPF. Until such needs have been objectively assessed and identified, the Council cannot identify the most appropriate strategy. Accordingly, the Plans do not currently conform to paragraphs 14, 47, 158 and 159 of the NPPF and are unsound.</li> <li>As up to date data has not been published on economic and demographic needs it is only possible to comment on principles. The current Cambridge centred strategy remains a valid approach if the local economy is to be supported, affordability issues are to be tackled and the strategy is to address the implications of climate change. It is also critical that these local plans address the shortfall at Cambridge created by the decision by Marshall not relocate before 2031</li> </ul> <p><b>.COMMENTS:</b></p>
Paragraph 5.2  Support:2 Object: 4	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Community needs it.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport system cannot cope at the moment</li> </ul>

<p>Comment: 1</p>	<p>even without more growth. Journey times by car are too long. When it rains cycle use declines and the roads clog up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sustainable development strategy has homes provided in "locations accessible to new jobs". If the LPAs do not follow this principle and jobs and homes are not located close to Cambridge the plans would be contrary to paragraph 37 of the NPPF and therefore unsound. Paragraph 37 states: Planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.</li> <li>• Reject need for growth if this involves attracting migrants to the area. Provide homes and jobs only for local people to protect the environment.</li> <li>• Growth is likely to reduce quality of life for future residents. Challenge the idea that new jobs must be within Cambridge. Modern technology and communication reduce the need for institutions/companies to be within the city. South Cambs moved its administration to Cambourne. Why does the County Council need its administrative base in Cambridge? This applies also to stockbrokers, insurance companies, banks and other offices. Both Universities and Addenbrooke's campus could consider devolution of some departments to areas beyond the city.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ickleton Parish Council</b> - Growth on the scale planned may inevitably undermine the quality of life. Management of traffic needs to be prioritised, as there is no justification in assuming that car-based commuting to jobs will reduce overall. The roads are struggling to cope at present.</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 5.3</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 3 Comment: 3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Community needs it.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The UK is entering a period of lower growth and is a mature OECD economy. It and the Cambridge area should shift from a growth model to an enhanced quality of life model. More green space, tackle congestion, more bike paths, more public facilities. Not more houses and more people.</li> <li>• From a transport perspective, new settlements at Waterbeach and Bourne Airfield are less sustainable than new development located within, or on the edge of, Cambridge and will lead to increased car travel and congestion. The LPAs must employ a strategy which conforms with paragraph 30 of the NPPF by supporting patterns of development which facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport. The viability and</li> </ul>

	<p>deliverability of the new settlement growth strategy are uncertain so would be found unsound.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wish to see specific recognition that even if one member of a household is able to find employment close to the home, others may well not and may have to commute to work/school etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investment in public transport, cycleways and pedestrian safety is essential if reduction in car usage is planned. Not necessarily linked to closeness to jobs (eg guided bus/cycle commuters from St Ives into Cambridge).</li> <li>Is there data to back up assumptions about where people want to live and are likely to want to work?.</li> <li>Agree with the need for homes to be close to work but question the anti-car policy. People are entitled to use their car in the absence of cheap &amp; timely public transport. Cycling is not a serious option for many people. Regardless of the current congestion levels given the growth we will have to manage we will have to build both increased roadspace and transport infrastructure. Emissions will be irrelevant when new technology becomes established in modern vehicles.</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 5.4</p> <p>Support: 1 Object: 2 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Community needs it</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree that the LEFM is a more reliable basis than the EEFM on which to determine future development needs. The LEFM is based on population projections which are out of date and inconsistent with the 2011 Census which demonstrates higher population growth in the past driven by in-migration. This is therefore an inappropriate basis for long-term strategic planning. The higher figures within the EEFM would be a better basis for planning moving forward so that housing delivery is not seen as a potential barrier to economic growth..</li> <li>Although the LEFM may be economic-led, the issues facing the Councils do not just relate to future job growth. There is an existing chronic shortage of affordable and market homes, which fuels increases in housing and land values, making the area more unaffordable. The EEFM and the higher forecasts in the LEFM represent the opportunity to respond positive to the opportunities for growth and to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development. It is clear from the approach at other local plan examinations that a capacity-led approach to development does not accord with the NPPF.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 5.4 1<sup>st</sup> bullet</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p>

<p>Support:1 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Community needs it.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Let's hope the choice of forecasting model is correct. If it is not then a catastrophic error of judgement will have been made.</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 5.4 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will spoil the Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 5.5</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 3 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Records concern that outcome of the previous consultation on these points is not available.</li> <li>Many homes contain two working adults. Why then are more new homes in Cambridge planned than new jobs anticipated for all but the medium option? The same is true for the low option in S. Cambs, although not for the medium or high.</li> <li>"Low", "medium" and "high" growth scenarios fall short of "economic-led" growth scenario identified by Edge Analytics. To ignore these forecasts would be contrary to NPPF, which confirms Government's commitment to ensuring planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities are advised to use evidence base to ensure local plan meets full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. Recent Local Plan Inspector's Reports have required local planning authorities to review housing analysis against Government's household projections. Dacorum Inspector's Preliminary Findings warned that because local authority did not use full objectively assessed housing needs as starting point, significant risk the Core Strategy would be found unsound.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - The County Council is pleased to see that the medium option job targets have been retained across both plans. These may still be challenging in the short term given the national growth rates published for the next 5 years but need to be retained to reflect a positive and supportive attitude to employment growth (at least longer term) in the Cambridge Area.</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 5.6</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council's evidence base is still being formulated and key parts of the evidence base such as an up-to-date assessment of housing</li> </ul>

Comment: 1

needs and other requirements have yet to be finalised to inform the current consultation. This approach does not conform to guidance within paragraphs 14, 47, 158 and 159 of the NPPF. The development strategy must first objectively assess housing, employment and other needs and develop the most sustainable development strategy to meet those needs. The Council's suggested Development Strategy does not do this. Consequently the plans are unsound.

**COMMENTS:**

- For the medium growth housing delivery of 21,500, over the period to 2031 (18 years), that works out at ~1194 houses that would need to be delivered across South Cambridgeshire per year.