## Matters and Issues for South Cambridgeshire Local Plan specific hearing sessions

#### Matter SC6A - Policy SS/5 Waterbeach New Town

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Chapter 3, Strategic Sites, Policy SS/5

#### **Issues:**

#### 1. General Policy

- i. Does the figure of 9,000 dwellings in paragraph 1 represent the maximum number of houses that would be developed on the site in accordance with this policy?
- ii. Would the proposed level of employment on the site be consistent with the proposed number of dwellings?
- iii. Given the direct rail link and the new station, does the new town have the potential to become an attractive location for people who work beyond the Cambridge Sub Region e.g. in London? If so, could this factor cause local people to be priced out of the housing market in this location?
- iv. Would the proposed new town result in an unacceptable loss of good quality agricultural land?
- v. The policy and reasoned justification makes reference to the significant amount of new infrastructure which will be required as a consequence of the development. Bearing in mind the requirements of paragraph 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework, is there a reasonable prospect that the provision of such infrastructure, and the services and facilities referred to in the policy and justification, could be achieved in a timely fashion, particularly if the proposed modification to remove any phasing of development (PM/SC/3/H) is accepted, whilst not putting at risk the overall viability of the development?
- vi. Should the policy clarify how the proposed new town would relate to the setting of the River Cam adjacent to the site?
- vii. Does the area of land identified on Inset H of the Policies Map provide sufficient capacity to achieve the quantum of development associated with the new town whilst ensuring that the setting and historic significance of Denny Abbey is preserved or enhanced?

Should the policy include a requirement for a setting study to be submitted at

v.1 Page 1 of 3

the planning application stage in respect of the relationship of the development to the designated heritage assets within the site?

- viii. Would any of the existing facilities within the site be retained e.g. sports facilities?
- ix. Would the provision of town centre uses be detrimental to the existing convenience retail offer in Waterbeach village?
- x. Would other land not identified on Inset H of the Policies Map be required to facilitate storm and foul drainage arrangements?
- xi. Should the policy specifically require a surface water and foul water drainage water strategy?

### 2 Future Area Action Plan Development Plan Document (AAP)

- i. Does the preparation and subsequent adoption of an AAP represent an appropriate mechanism in planning terms for the implementation of this development? If this is not a sound approach, would the Council's further proposed modification to prepare SPD rectify that issue?
- ii. <u>Paragraph 6n</u>: Should reference also be made to measures to mitigate the effect of the development on the wider landscape area including Landbeach and Milton settlements?
- iii. <u>Paragraph 6p</u>: Would the assessment of heritage assets also include World War II structures on the site which may be worthy of retention?
- iv. <u>Paragraph 6w</u>: Is there a reasonable prospect that the effect of the development on the ecology and biodiversity of the site could be adequately mitigated?
- v. <u>Paragraph 6x</u>: Would the relocation of the railway station be detrimental to the residents of Waterbeach village in terms of the increased travel distances to a sustainable mode of transport?
- vi. <u>Paragraph 6hh</u>: Should there be a cross reference to Policy TI/8: *Infrastructure* and New Developments as the policy indicates that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make a scheme acceptable in planning terms?

v.1 Page 2 of 3

- vii. <u>Paragraph 6ii</u>: Would the flood risk reduction measures be sufficiently resilient to the effect of climate change over the lifetime of the new town given that it is low lying land? Would this form part of the flood risk assessment for the site?
- viii. <u>Paragraph 6jj</u>: Should reference also be made to the creation of appropriate community governance arrangements to assist the development of the new community?
  - ix. Paragraph 6kk and 6ll: Given the previous use of the site for military purposes, is there a reasonable prospect that the de-contamination of the site could be achieved satisfactorily so as to enable residential occupation whilst not prejudicing the viability of the proposed development?

### 3 Council's Further proposed modifications November 2016

i. Are these modifications necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan?

v.1 Page 3 of 3

## Matters and Issues for South Cambridgeshire Local Plan specific hearing sessions

### Matter SC6B - Policy SS/7 Northstowe Extension

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Chapter 3, Strategic Sites, Policy SS/7

### **Issues:**

#### 1 General Policy

- i. Is there a realistic prospect that the reserve land to which the policy relates would be required for development within the Plan period? If so, should this be reflected in Figure 3 of the Plan (Housing Trajectory)?
- ii. Has the aim to meet the Northstowe Area Action Plan (2007) [AAP] target of at least 4,800 homes by 2016 as set out in the Objective D3/a and Policies NS/7 and E3/c of the document, and the Housing Trajectory for Northstowe 2007-2016, been achieved?
- iii. Should the policy refer to 10,000 homes in order to be consistent with the 2006 Plan, the AAP and the Northstowe Development Framework Masterplan?
- iv. Would Objective D9/a of the AAP relating to the development of an Archaeological Strategy directly apply to the reserve land?
- v. Will the policies in the AAP be subject to review to ensure that no out of date policy requirements (e.g. Policy D13/b) are applied to development proposals on the reserve land?

v.1 Page 1 of 1

## Matters and Issues for South Cambridgeshire Local Plan specific hearing sessions

### Matter SC6C - Policy SS/6 New Village at Bourn Airfield

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Chapter 3, Strategic Sites, Policy SS/6

#### **Issues:**

#### **1 General Policy**

- i. Does the site represent a sustainable location in respect of the proximity and accessibility to key centres of employment?
- ii. Would the proposed size of the new village be sufficient to make it sustainable in terms of its ability to support local services and facilities?
- iii. Does the area of land identified on Inset I of the Policies Map provide sufficient capacity to achieve the quantum of development associated with the new village?
- iv. In respect of paragraph 3.40, what proportion of the site as a whole can be classified as previously developed land?
- v. Would the new village result in an over intensification of relatively closely knit settlements south of the A428 creating a form of ribbon development which would be uncharacteristic of this part of South Cambridgeshire?
- vi. The policy and reasoned justification refer to the need for extensive off-site transport infrastructure provision in order to mitigate the transport impacts associated with creation of the new village, along with the Cambourne West development which has been granted planning permission. Bearing in mind the requirements of paragraph 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework, is there a reasonable prospect that the provision of such infrastructure, and the services and facilities referred to in the policy and justification, could be achieved in a timely fashion, particularly if the proposed modification to remove any phasing of development (PM/SC/3/I) is accepted, whilst not putting at risk the overall viability of the development?
- vii. Would the proposed new village result in an unacceptable loss of good quality agricultural land?
- viii. Would the provision of town centre uses be detrimental to the existing convenience retail offer in the neighbouring villages?

v.1 Page 1 of 3

- ix. Should the policy specifically require a storm water attenuation strategy and a foul drainage strategy for the development?
- x. Could the loss of the existing aviation related employment uses be accommodated elsewhere?

#### 2 Future Area Action Plan Development Plan Document (AAP)

- i. <u>Paragraph 6</u>: Does the preparation and subsequent adoption of an AAP represent an appropriate mechanism in planning terms for the implementation of this development? If this is not a sound approach, would the Council's further proposed modification to prepare SPD rectify that issue.
- ii. Paragraph 6b: Would the proposed level of employment on the site be consistent with the proposed number of dwellings?

  In this regard, should the paragraph be consistent with Policy E/12: New Employment Development in Villages which restricts employment uses to B1, B2 and B8?
- iii. <u>Paragraph 6m</u>: Should there be a reference to the provision of a high degree of connectivity between existing green corridors and ecological networks?
- iv. <u>Paragraph 6q</u>: Is there a reasonable prospect that the effect of the development on the ecology and biodiversity of the site could be adequately mitigated?
- v. <u>Paragraph 6u</u>: Would the Park and Ride facility for the A428 corridor be critical to the sustainability of the location of the new village in transport terms? Would it have to be funded through a planning obligation as referred to above?
- vi. <u>Paragraph 6y</u>: The criterion makes reference to highway improvements. Should the proposed schemes therefore be set out in the policy if they critical to the implementation of the policy?
- vii. <u>Paragraph 6aa</u>: Should there be a direct access for private motor vehicles to the Broadway provided that the appropriate measures are put in place to mitigate the traffic impacts in terms of highway safety?
- viii. <u>Paragraph 6cc</u>: Should there be a cross reference to Policy TI/8: *Infrastructure* and New Developments as the policy indicates that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make a scheme acceptable in planning terms?

v.1 Page 2 of 3

- ix. <u>Paragraph 6ee</u>: Would the flood risk reduction measures be sufficiently resilient to the effect of climate change over the lifetime of the new village? Would this form part of the flood risk assessment for the site?
- x. <u>Paragraph 6ff</u>: Should reference also be made to the creation of appropriate community governance arrangements to assist the development of the new community?
- xi. <u>Paragraphs 6gg and 6hh</u>: Given the previous use of the site for military purposes, is there a reasonable prospect that the de-contamination of the site could be achieved satisfactorily so as to enable residential occupation whilst not prejudicing the viability of the proposed development?
- xii. <u>Site Preparation</u>: Should the policy require a pre-development archaeological evaluation?

### 3 Council's Further proposed modifications November 2016

i. Are these modifications necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan?

v.1 Page 3 of 3