



Examination into the Soundness of the  
Cambridge Local Plan and  
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan

**Matter PM1 – Housing**

Joint Matter Statement by  
Cambridge City Council and  
South Cambridgeshire District Council

May 2016



## Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
<b>Matter PM1A Objectively Assessed Housing Need</b>	<b>1</b>
PM1A.1 Does the further work on objectively assessed housing need (OAHN), carried out by Peter Brett Associates (PBA) for the Councils (RD/MC/040) ensure that the methodology used is now generally compliant with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)?	1
PM1A.2 Bearing in mind that PPG notes that no single approach will provide a definitive answer, do the OAHN figures of 14,000 new dwellings for Cambridge City and 19,500 new dwellings for South Cambridgeshire provide a robust basis to underpin the provision on new housing in the Local Plans. If not, why not and why are alternative figures to be preferred?	1
PM1A.3 The OAHN figures are also the housing requirement figures in both plans. What is the relationship between these figures and the 1,000 extra homes which are part of the City Deal.	8
<b>Matter PM1B 5 Year Housing Land Supply and Joint Trajectory</b>	<b>9</b>
PM1B.1 The Framework (paragraph 47) states, amongst other things, that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements. Planning Policy Guidance Ref 010 2a-010-20140306 advises: <i>Where there is a joint plan, housing requirements and the need to identify a five year supply of sites can apply across the joint plan area. The approach being taken should be set out clearly in the plan.</i> Are there any local circumstances which justify the use of a joint trajectory without a joint plan? If so what are they?	9
PM1B.2 Will the use of a joint trajectory assist in meeting the objectives of the Framework, including the delivery of sustainable development and boosting, significantly, the supply of land for housing?	15
PM1B.3 Is it clear how this approach would work in practice; i.e how would the five year land supply would be calculated and updated; and it is clear how any failure to provide a five year supply would be resolved?	19
PM1B.4 The Memorandum of Understanding (RD/Strat/350) indicated that, as part of the City Deal arrangements, the Councils have agreed to prepare a joint Local Plan and Transport Strategy starting in 2019. Should this commitment be expressly included in the Local Plans?	21

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>22</b>
Appendix 1: List of Reference Documents	22

## Introduction

1. This statement sets out both Councils' response in relation to the Inspector's Matter PM1 relating to objectively assessed housing need and the joint housing trajectory.
2. All the documents referred to in this statement are listed in Appendix 1, and examination library document reference numbers are used throughout the statement for convenience.

## Matter PM1A Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN)

### Modification PM/CC/2/B and supporting modifications

### Modification PM/SC/2/H and supporting modifications

#### PM1A.1

**Does the further work on objectively assessed housing need (OAHN), carried out by Peter Brett Associates (PBA) for the Councils (RD/MC/040) ensure that the methodology used is now generally compliant with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). NB Following their letter to the Councils of 29th March 2016 the Inspectors expect this to have been addressed through the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground, which will form the basis for the discussion of any areas of disagreement at the hearings.**

#### PM1A.2

**Bearing in mind that PPG notes that no single approach will provide a definitive answer, do the OAHN figures of 14,000 new dwellings for Cambridge City and 19,500 new dwellings for South Cambridgeshire provide a robust basis to underpin the provision on new housing in the Local Plans. If not, why not and why are alternative figures to be preferred?**

### Overview

1. The Councils' objectively assessed housing need is derived from evidence in the Cambridge Sub Region SHMA of May 2013 and the OAHN Further Evidence report prepared by PBA in November 2015.
2. Within the ambit of the issues raised by the Inspectors in relation to Matter PM1A, this statement addresses many of the significant points raised in representations by third parties in relation to OAHN. These points are summarised within the Proposed Modifications Report on Consultation (March 2016)<sup>1</sup>, with those points relevant to the PM1A matters addressed in this statement.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Modifications – Report on Consultation – March 2016 (RD/MC/120) – for Cambridge – PM/CC/2/B, page A9, for South Cambridgeshire – PM/SC/2/H, page A130

*The NPPF and the SHMA*

3. The OAHN figures in the Local Plans submitted in March 2014 were derived from the Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)<sup>2</sup> published in May 2013. The SHMA was prepared to accord with the policies of the NPPF and particularly paragraphs 158 and 159 which relate to the evidence base needed for plan making. Paragraph 158 calls for an integrated approach to housing and employment matters and for market signals to be taken into account. Paragraph 159 requires the preparation of a SHMA to assess housing needs across a housing market area. SHMAs are required to identify the scale of housing likely to be needed over the plan period to meet household and population projections taking account of migration and demographic change. The NPPF did not set out any particular methodology for preparing SHMAs.
4. The SHMA (May 2013) considers the full market and affordable housing needs of the HMA as part of an integrated approach to future population, housing and economic needs, including forecast job numbers in accordance with NPPF paragraph 158 and 159. It is supported by the Population, Housing and Employment Technical Report<sup>3</sup>. The assessment of housing demand in the SHMA starts with ONS SNPP and therefore the original evidence source used is the same as that required by national policy. Furthermore, a particular local issue exists with relying on the national projections, with implausibly low national household projections for Cambridge. This influenced the approach taken in the SHMA. Economic forecasts and the employment-led population forecast from the EEFM are reflected in the overall assessment of future population, leading to an increase in the population forecast for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, where the demographic projections used in the SHMA alone would indicate lower future population figures. The housing requirements included in the Local Plans of 14,000 dwellings for Cambridge and 19,000 for South Cambridgeshire were derived from the OAHN identified in the SHMA and its supporting Technical Report. By following the same methodology for all districts, using the same evidence sources, the SHMA identifies consistent housing demand figures across the HMA, including for Cambridge. They were agreed in a Memorandum of Co-operation with all authorities in the Housing Market Area (HMA) under the duty to co-operate in 2013<sup>4</sup>. The Councils' approach to OAHN leading up to submission was reasonable and rational.

*The NPPG and the PBA Further Evidence report*

5. The NPPG<sup>5</sup> published in March 2014 (as the Local Plans' were being submitted for examination) provided much more detailed guidance on the approach to be followed in the assessment of housing need, including in relation to market signals. The NPPG methodology starts with demographic projections, specifically the CLG 2012 household projections, with other factors including market signals and future

---

<sup>2</sup> Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (May 2013) (RD/Strat/090)

<sup>3</sup> Population, Housing and Employment Forecasts Technical Report (April 2013) (RD/Strat/080)

<sup>4</sup> Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation: Supporting the Spatial Approach 2011-2031 (May 2013) (RD/Strat/100)

<sup>5</sup> National Planning Practice Guidance (RD/NP/020)

employment coming into the calculation later through adjustments to the demographic projections.

6. The NPPG at paragraph reference 2a-005-20140306 states that local planning authorities may consider departing from the standard methodology set out in the guidance, but should explain why their particular local circumstances have led them to adopt a different approach. NPPG paragraph reference 2a-014 goes on to say that establishing future need for housing is not an exact science and that no single approach will provide a definitive answer.
7. Informed by the Matter 3 hearings into housing need held in November 2014, the Inspectors' interim conclusions letter of 20<sup>th</sup> May 2015 expressed concerns that the Councils' approach had not fully taken into account the NPPG guidance on market signals or affordable housing, and also asked the Councils' to consider whether the 2012 based CLG household projections published in February 2015 suggested a different level of need.
8. To address the issues identified in the Inspectors' interim conclusions letter the Councils' commissioned PBA to prepare the OAHN Further Evidence report<sup>6</sup>. It considers:
  - whether the 2012 based CLG household projections published in February 2015 suggest a different level of need;
  - whether an assessment of market signals justifies an uplift to these CLG demographic projections; and
  - whether they should be increased in order to provide more affordable housing.
9. The PBA Further Evidence report concludes that:
  - For South Cambridgeshire - the 2012 CLG household projections adjusted for market signals has identified a higher housing need than that derived from the SHMA. A consequential proposed modification to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan increases the housing requirement from 19,000 to 19,500 homes<sup>7</sup>. It is estimated that affordable housing need can be met in full and no further increase is proposed.
  - For Cambridge - the 2012 CLG household projections are implausibly low and an alternative figure is identified. When adjusted for market signals the housing need identified is lower than that derived from the SHMA. The SHMA takes account of future employment growth to 2031 and the figure of 14,000 homes remains the appropriate OAHN as the higher of the two alternative housing need figures. It is estimated that just under half of the affordable housing need will be met. No increase in OAHN is proposed as it may undermine housing delivery in other parts

---

<sup>6</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence (November 2015) (RD/MC/040)

<sup>7</sup> South Cambridgeshire Proposed Modifications (March 2016) (RD/MC/150) Proposed Modification PM/SC/2/H

of the HMA and it would probably not reduce the local shortage of affordable housing<sup>8</sup>.

10. Together the SHMA and the PBA Further Evidence report provide a robust basis to underpin the provision of new housing in the Local Plans and are generally compliant with the NPPG.

#### *Statement of Common and Uncommon Ground*

11. The requested statement of common and uncommon ground with representors who have provided either technical criticisms of the Councils' OAHN, or an alternative OAHN figure, is provided in the examination library<sup>9</sup>. It summarises the Councils' approach to the assessment of objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) and explains why the Councils' approach has departed from NPPG guidance in a number of instances. The SOCG considers the extent to which the Councils' approach to assessing housing need (the SHMA together with the PBA report) is consistent with advice in Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). Where alternative methods of calculating OAHN are being proposed by representors, the SOCG also allows representors to focus on the key assumptions and methodology used, and the implications of these for the outcomes of the modelling. The SOCG allows representors to indicate if they agree or disagree with the Councils' approach and if not, they have had the opportunity to add their position.
12. The contributions made by several participants to the SOCG relate to issues that have already been considered at earlier examination hearings and were not matters raised in the Inspectors' letter, nor do they arise from the Councils' proposed modifications. Moreover, and in several respects, these include matters that appear not to have been raised within the representations made by those participants to the proposed modifications. The Councils do not propose to respond to these matters at this stage. The Councils will review those matters and the extent to which they are pursued by others in their statements, and respond to the extent that is necessary and is considered to be helpful to the Inspectors in advance of the resumption of the examination.

#### Issues Raised by the Inspectors

13. The following sections set out how the Councils have addressed each of the issues raised by the Inspectors in their preliminary findings in more detail.
  - 2012 based CLG Household Projections
14. The SNPP/CLG 2012 projections show a housing need in Cambridge of 6,795 dwellings for the period 2011 to 2031, and for South Cambridgeshire a housing need of 17,579 for 2011-2031. The Cambridge figure remains implausibly low, as generally accepted and as identified in the SHMA.

---

<sup>8</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence (November 2015) (RD/MC/040) paragraph 4.14

<sup>9</sup> RD/SCG/430

15. The PBA Further Evidence report examines the reasons why the CLG 2012 household projections cannot be relied on for Cambridge, explaining the differences as primarily due to unattributable population change (UPC) largely due to unrecorded or misrecorded migration flows (on pages 6-13 of the report). In contrast for South Cambridgeshire the report finds no local evidence to justify adjusting the official population projections to include the UPC.
16. The PBA further evidence report looks at four alternative demographic scenarios from Edge Analytics alongside the 2012 based CLG household projections. Table 2.1 of their report summarises the results of the projections. It concludes that the 10yr HH12 projection is the most appropriate as a longer base period provides a more robust projection being a better reflection of underlying economic trends, is less impacted by short-term fluctuations and the economic cycle whereas a 5yr base period is strongly affected by the recession and its aftermath<sup>10</sup>.
17. The report also examines the issue of household representative rates concluding that the HRRs from the CLG 2012 household projections are to be preferred as the most realistic and preferable to 2008 based HRRs. This issue is examined in further detail in the PBA March 2016 report OAHN Response to Objectors<sup>11</sup>. The report concludes that there is no justification for upward adjustment to the CLG 2012 HRRs. At a national level these rates provide the best available view of future household growth (and formation), as stated in the NPPG at paragraph ID: 2a-016-20150227.
18. Starting from the SNPP/CLG 2012 projections, and after testing and adjustments in line with the PPG, the PBA Further Evidence report considers that the most robust trend-based demographic projections available at this time are:
  - For **Cambridge**, the Edge 10yr HH12 projection, which implies **10,069** new dwellings in 2011-31;
  - For **South Cambridgeshire**, the SNPP/CLG 2012 household projection, which implies **17,579** new dwellings.
  - For Greater Cambridge as a whole, 27,648 net new dwellings.
19. These projections show fewer dwellings than the SHMA (14,000 for Cambridge and 19,000 for South Cambridgeshire).
  - Market Signals
20. In line with the NPPG the PBA report says that the demographic-based figures of 10,069 dwellings for Cambridge and 17,579 for South Cambridgeshire are only the second step in determining the OAN (after the first step, which is the CLG projections). They simply roll forward past demographic trends, taking no account of future changes in the factors that drive those trends, such as government policy and

---

<sup>10</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence (November 2015) (RD/MC/040) paragraphs 2.35 and 2.36

<sup>11</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Responses to Objectors (March 2016) (RD/MC/041) paragraphs 2.1 to 2.30

the economic climate. In line with the PPG, if such factors are expected to change in the future the trend-based projections should be adjusted accordingly.

21. The PBA Further Evidence report notes that the NPPG does not specify the size of an indicated upward adjustment to OAHN<sup>12</sup>. The report examines how other Inspectors have approached the matter at Eastleigh, Uttlesford and Canterbury. The matter is found to be one for judgment. Market signals are found to point to 'modest' market pressures in South Cambridgeshire similar to Eastleigh and Uttlesford suggesting an uplift of 10% to the demographic starting point is appropriate. For Cambridge market signals are more marked and reference is made to the 30% uplift at Canterbury where market signals are similar. Importantly the report notes that in relation to market signals the adjustments of 10% and 30% are maximum estimates as the relevant Inspectors' took account of other factors, which in the case of Canterbury also included future employment.
22. The PBA Further Evidence report concludes that market signals warrant upward adjustment to the demographic starting point for both Cambridge (10,069 dwellings) and South Cambridgeshire (17,579 dwellings). The study concludes that:
  - **For Cambridge** – an uplift of **30%** is appropriate giving an OAHN figure of **13,090 homes**
  - **For South Cambridgeshire** – an uplift of **10%** is appropriate giving an OAHN figure of **19,337 homes**
23. For Cambridge the SHMA figure is above the PBA Further Evidence OAHN assessment of 13,090 dwellings. This suggests that the figure should be further adjusted up to the SHMA 14,000 dwellings figure to take account of employment trends, which are an integrated part of the SHMA methodology.
24. For South Cambridgeshire the 19,000 SHMA figure is fractionally below the PBA Further Evidence OAHN assessment of 19,337 dwellings. The new figure took account of past demographic trends and market signals but not future jobs, which are integrated into the SHMA. If housing is built in line with the new assessment it will provide for slightly more homes than are identified in the SHMA as being required to support expected job growth. Hence there is no justification for a 'jobs-uplift' to the new assessment.
25. Criticisms of the PBA further evidence report in representations to the Proposed Modifications consultation are examined in the PBA OAHN Response to Objectors report<sup>13</sup>. This finds that the conclusions of the PBA OAHN Further Evidence report remain valid.

---

<sup>12</sup> National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (RD/NP/020) ref ID 2a-020-20140306

<sup>13</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Responses to Objectors (March 2016) (RD/MC/041)

➤ Affordable Need

26. The PBA Further Evidence report identifies that South Cambridgeshire should be able to receive enough developer contributions from market housing to meet all of its affordable housing need whilst Cambridge will receive enough developer contributions to meet just under half of its affordable need.
27. In line with the PPG the report considers whether the 14,000 dwellings included in the Cambridge Local Plan should be increased to help pay for more affordable homes. It looks at the findings of other Inspectors on this matter, who have been cautious in recommending uplifts to overall housing targets in response to affordable need. The report concludes that for Cambridge, it will depend partly on the city's sustainable capacity and the viability of market housing, and that an increase in provision may undermine housing delivery in other parts of the HMA and would probably not reduce the local shortage of affordable housing<sup>14</sup>. Nevertheless, the increase in the OAHN for Cambridge of 3,931 dwellings over the demographic starting point from 10,069 to 14,000 in response to market signals (PBA report) and economic factors (SHMA) will also help deliver an additional number of affordable homes.
28. It is also relevant to note that the NPPG<sup>15</sup> does not refer directly to uplifting OAHN in a Local Plan but to '*An increase in the total housing figures included in the local plan*'. This wording must leave open a policy response of increasing housing supply as opposed to increasing the OAHN target. In this regard it can be noted that Cambridge has increased its housing supply since Local Plan submission to 14,682 including through proposed additional development at Cambridge East<sup>16</sup>, which would provide additional affordable homes.

---

<sup>14</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence (November 2015) (RD/MC/040) paragraph 4.14

<sup>15</sup> National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (RD/NP/020) paragraph ID 2a- 2a-029-20140306

<sup>16</sup> Cambridge Proposed Modifications (March 2016) (RD/MC/140) main modifications PM/CC/3/A and PM/CC/Policies Map/A

**PM1A.3**

**The OAHN figures are also the housing requirement figures in both plans. What is the relationship between these figures and the 1,000 extra homes which are part of the City Deal?**

29. There is no direct relationship between the OAHN figures that inform the Local Plan targets and the 1,000 additional homes forming part of the City Deal agreement.
30. The City Deal 1,000 additional homes was referred to in the Councils' Matter 8 statement (at paragraphs 47-48) as one factor that would provide flexibility in housing delivery, but was not relied on as part of the submitted Local Plans or as part of calculating housing supply. That remains the case.
31. The objectively assessed needs for housing for each local planning authority are also the housing requirement figures (although rounded for South Cambridgeshire). The Local Plans identify a deliverable and flexible supply of sites to achieve delivery, and the housing trajectory takes a robust and cautious approach.
32. Following the additional work on OAN undertaken in response to the Inspectors' letter of 30 May 2015, a modification is proposed to increase the OAN in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan by 500 dwellings to 19,500 homes.
33. As part of a separate process through the City Deal negotiations, the partners agreed to the delivery of 1,000 homes on rural exception sites by 2031 in addition to the housing targets included in the submitted Local Plans<sup>17</sup>. This reflects the Government's focus on the City Deal supporting economic growth and housing delivery. This was at the time when the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan was identifying an OAN of 19,000 homes.
34. The increase in the OAHN and housing target for South Cambridgeshire from 19,000 to 19,500 has the effect of incorporating 500 of the City Deal commitment into the housing requirement in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. The second half of the City Deal commitment (the remaining 500 homes) will be delivered either as additional windfalls, most likely in the latter part of the plan period, or as part of the preparation of the joint Local Plan for Greater Cambridge, which the partners have committed to starting in 2019. This is a separate matter to the Local Plan target and is a matter for the City Deal.
35. The process of monitoring the delivery of these 1000 dwellings is being considered by the City Deal and it is expected that a report will be considered by the Executive Board in July 2016. For information, the Report will be made available to the Inspectors at that time.

---

<sup>17</sup> Greater Cambridge City Deal (RD/Strat/300)

## Matter PM1B 5 Year Land Supply and Joint Trajectory

### Modification PM/CC/2/C and supporting modifications

### Modification PM/SC/2/B and supporting modifications

#### PM1B.1

**The Framework (paragraph 47) states, amongst other things, that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements. Planning Policy Guidance Ref 010 2a-010-20140306 advises: *Where there is a joint plan, housing requirements and the need to identify a five year supply of sites can apply across the joint plan area. The approach being taken should be set out clearly in the plan. Are there any local circumstances which justify the use of a joint trajectory without a joint plan? If so what are they?***

36. The Councils consider that the Memorandum of Understanding<sup>18</sup> (MoU) and the adoption of a joint housing trajectory for the purposes of calculating five year land supply is consistent with national policy and that local circumstances fully justify the approach.
37. Within the ambit of the issues raised by the Inspectors in relation to Matter PM1B, this statement addresses many of the significant points raised in representations by third parties in relation to the joint housing trajectory. These points are summarised within the Proposed Modifications Report on Consultation (March 2016)<sup>19</sup>, with those points relevant to the PM1B matters addressed in this statement.
38. The MoU confirms the agreement that the housing trajectories for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire should be considered together for the purposes of the phasing of housing delivery and for calculating five year supply for plan making and decision taking. This has now been reflected in Proposed Modifications to both plans<sup>20</sup>, which have been subject to public consultation following the Inspectors' letter of May 2015<sup>21</sup>.
39. The Councils set out further justification for the approach to main modifications related to the MoU in a supplement to their statement to matter 8<sup>22</sup>. It sets out that an agreement in the form of the memorandum of understanding is wholly consistent with the letter, the spirit and the intention of the statutory duty to co-operate and is grounded in national policy guidance, and in particular reflect:

---

<sup>18</sup> Memorandum of Understanding between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council: Greater Cambridge Joint Housing Trajectory. September 2014 (RD/Strat/350)

<sup>19</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Modifications – Report on Consultation – March 2016 (RD/MC/120) – for Cambridge – PM/CC/2/C, page A15, for South Cambridgeshire – PM/SC/2/B, page A92

<sup>20</sup> Cambridge Proposed Modifications (RD/MC/140) proposed modification PM/CC/2/C, South Cambridgeshire Proposed Modifications (RD/MC/150) proposed modification PM/SC/2/B

<sup>21</sup> Letter from the Inspectors to the Councils dated 20 May 2015 regarding Preliminary Conclusions (RD/GEN/170)

<sup>22</sup> Matter 8 – Housing Land Supply and Delivery - Councils' Position Statement on Main Modifications (M8/CCC&SCDC) to reflect the Memorandum of Understanding (RD/EX/070), paragraphs 1 to 11

- NPPF<sup>23</sup> paragraph 182 bullet 1, which refers to plans meeting “*unmet requirements for neighbouring authorities...*”<sup>24</sup>
  - NPPF paragraph 181, which refers to cooperation being a “*continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation*”.
  - NPPG<sup>25</sup> paragraph ID:9-016-20140306 which provides expressly for such agreements to implement a joint agreed strategy including agreements as to “*timing of unmet need*”; and
  - NPPG paragraph ID:3-035-20140306 which states that where undersupply cannot be met in the first 5 years, local planning authorities will need to work with neighbouring authorities under the ‘Duty to Cooperate’.
40. Planning Practice Guidance Ref 010 2a-010-20140306 advises: ‘*Where there is a joint plan, housing requirements and the need to identify a five year supply of sites can apply across the joint plan area. The approach being taken should be set out clearly in the plan.*’<sup>26</sup> This guidance does not preclude areas without a joint plan following the same approach.
41. Both plans are consistent with paragraph 47 of the NPPF in that both Councils have committed to meeting their own objectively assessed needs in full within their respective areas. Paragraph 47 does not say that a local planning authority must meet its five year supply requirement within its area.
42. Applying the MoU and joint housing trajectory are entirely appropriate in principle and consistent with national policy. It is also fully justified in the circumstances facing the Cambridge area.
43. The MoU is specifically about the phasing of the delivery of housing to meet objectively assessed needs in the Greater Cambridge area during the plan period. It enables the Councils to deliver a sustainable development strategy that responds appropriately to the planning circumstances of the area, , reflecting the unique circumstances of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire as the only place in the country where a rural district entirely and tightly encircles an urban area and the logical delivery of that sustainable development strategy.
44. Through joint working and co-operation during plan preparation, the Councils have demonstrated why the combined strategy is the most appropriate and sustainable for the Cambridge area. The development sequence seeks to prioritise development in the Cambridge urban area, followed by the edge of Cambridge where development would not cause significant harm to the purposes of the Green Belt, then identified new settlements, and finally better served villages.
45. Due to the tightly drawn administrative boundary for Cambridge, the second stage of the sequence involves cross boundary sites. These form a significant element of the strategy of both plans totalling around 9,500 dwellings (see Table 1 below). The cross

---

<sup>23</sup> National Planning Policy Framework (RD/NP/010)

<sup>24</sup> Note: Both Councils remain committed to meeting their own Objectively Assessed Need for housing.

<sup>25</sup> Planning Practice Guidance (RD/NP/020)

<sup>26</sup> Planning Practice Guidance (RD/NP/020) Ref 010 2a-010-20140306

boundary nature of these sites has resulted in a joined up approach to their planning, including a Joint Development Control Committee. The majority of these sites are included in the adopted plans and many now have planning permission and are under construction. To ensure the co-ordinated development of these sites it is logical to combine the housing trajectories in order to reflect the phasing and progress of development across these sites as it is happening on the ground now and will continue to do so.

**Table 1: Joint Strategic Sites**

Site	Authority	Number of homes
Cambridge East	Cambridge	837
	South Cambridgeshire	1,720
Trumpington Meadows	Cambridge	558
	South Cambridgeshire	642
NIAB/Darwin Green	Cambridge	1,780
	South Cambridgeshire	1,000
North West Cambridge	Cambridge	1,850
	South Cambridgeshire	1,155
<b>Total</b>		<b>9,542</b>

Note: the figures in this table are taken from the joint housing trajectory included in the Housing Land Supply Update<sup>27</sup> and include the proposed modification to carry forward more of the allocation at Cambridge East – north of Cherry Hinton<sup>28</sup>.

46. The joint housing trajectory shows development coming forward within the urban area of Cambridge and on the edge of Cambridge early in the plan period, reflecting the current situation, with newly identified new settlements following later in the plan period as they have a longer lead-in time before the start of delivery. The fringe sites that were released from the Green Belt in the last round of plan-making are now well underway and delivering new homes, jobs and associated infrastructure on the ground. A particular local circumstance is that these cross-boundary sites are building out from the edge of the existing built-up area with more homes being built in Cambridge in the early part of the plan period and then moving into South Cambridgeshire later on. The effect of this is that Cambridge on its own has significantly above a five year housing land supply during those early years and South Cambridgeshire alone has less than a five year supply over the same period, but that when the two are put together there is a rolling five year land supply reflecting the way the development strategy across the two areas is being built out. It is entirely logical to consider the area holistically, rather than have policy dictated by whether a dwelling is built one side of an administrative boundary on a joint development site rather than the other.

<sup>27</sup> Housing Land Supply Update (November 2015) (RD/MC/050), Appendix 4

<sup>28</sup> Cambridge Proposed Modifications (RD/MC/140) proposed modification PM/CC/3/A, South Cambridgeshire Proposed Modifications (RD/MC/150) proposed modification PM/SC/3/A

47. The NPPF requires Local Plans to meet Objectively Assessed Needs, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework<sup>29</sup>. The focus of policies in the NPPF is to achieve sustainable development. Both Councils remain committed to delivering their full objectively assessed need within their areas. The joint trajectory is about the phasing of housing delivery of the sustainable development strategy. Since the joint housing trajectory supports the delivery of a sustainable development strategy for the Cambridge area, it must follow that it is consistent with the NPPF. As addressed in question PM1B.2, the requirement to maintain a five year land supply in the early years of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan could compromise the ability to deliver a sustainable development strategy for the Cambridge area.
48. In addition to the matters set out above, which demonstrate that the MoU and the joint trajectory is consistent with national policy, the MoU also responds to and is justified by particular circumstances impacting on planning in the Cambridge area, some of which have arisen since the plans were submitted, and which were outlined in the Councils' Matter 8 hearing statement<sup>30</sup>:
- The signing of the Greater Cambridge City Deal<sup>31</sup> on 19 June 2014, which defines the area covered by the two districts as 'Greater Cambridge' and recognises the strong inter-relationship between the two areas. The Councils have agreed to prepare a joint Local Plan and Transport Strategy starting in 2019. The joint housing trajectory is a logical response to the City Deal covering the two areas and a step towards the next joint Local Plan.
  - The NPPG was published too late to influence the submitted Local Plans but provides for the circumstances that where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply that it can seek agreement with its neighbours under the Duty to Co-operate to meet that shortfall<sup>32</sup>. This recent guidance justifies the joint housing trajectory approach, in the circumstances where South Cambridgeshire may not be able to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land, depending how it is calculated.
  - Two Section 78 planning application appeals allowed on 25 June 2014<sup>33</sup> for sites in Waterbeach in South Cambridgeshire on the basis that the Inspector concluded that the Council was not able to satisfactorily demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land as required by the NPPF. He commented that the approach of a joint housing trajectory is 'without precedent' and also concluded that there was no sound basis for taking the Greater Cambridge City Deal into account in the current 5-year housing land supply, which was at that time still to be signed. The City Deal has now been signed and good progress has been made on this significant initiative. The MoU addresses the appeal Inspector's

---

<sup>29</sup> National Planning Policy Framework (RD/NP/010) paragraph 47

<sup>30</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Examination Matter 8 Statement paragraph 76

<sup>31</sup> Greater Cambridge City Deal (RD/Strat/300)

<sup>32</sup> Planning Practice Guidance (RD/NP/020) Ref 010 2a-010-20140306

<sup>33</sup> Appeal Decision: APP/W0530/A/13/2207961 Land to the west of Cody Road, Waterbeach, Cambridge, CB25 9LS. June 2014 (RD/Strat/330) and Appeal Decision: APP/W0530/A/13/2209166 Land north of Bannold Road, Waterbeach, Cambridgeshire. June 2014 (RD/Strat/340)

concerns by formalising the agreement between the Councils for a joint housing trajectory.

- The East Cambridgeshire Local Plan Inspector endorsed the 2013 Memorandum of Co-operation in his interim conclusions of 14 July 2014<sup>34</sup> (and subsequently in his final report of 9 March 2015<sup>35</sup>), including the approach to part of East Cambridgeshire's objectively assessed needs being met in Peterborough under the Duty to Co-operate, commenting that the approach is consistent with the principles of localism and national planning policy. Whilst not directly comparable, the agreement made under duty to cooperate affecting East Cambridgeshire is more significant than the MoU for a joint housing trajectory, in that it is dealing with where part of the objectively assessed need of East Cambridgeshire is met. The approach the Councils have taken here in the MoU is not about where part of their respective objectively assessed needs should be met, but simply about the phasing of sites to meet their respective needs in a sustainable way, taking account of the joint development strategy and sequence.
49. Through the Examination the Inspector will decide the most appropriate method of calculating five year supply for the districts and the appropriate buffer. If the Liverpool method and a 5% buffer is accepted by the Inspectors, as proposed by the Councils, then a joint approach would not be needed to demonstrate a five year housing land supply in South Cambridgeshire. However the MoU provides added flexibility and allows the plans to adapt to changing circumstances should they arise. The joint trajectory is not being put forward on a contingent basis. It fully reflects the development strategy of the two districts.
50. In summary, the modifications to the submitted plans proposed to reflect the MoU and the joint housing trajectory should be recommended so as to make the Plans sound on the basis that to do so is (a) consistent with, and reflects, the development strategy within both plans and, as such, is consistent with positive plan preparation, (b) justified, (c) effective and (d) consistent with national policy, as each of those terms are defined in NPPF paragraph 182.
51. The consequences of not endorsing the joint housing trajectory would be significant. The only alternative to the joint housing trajectory, subject to the decision regarding the method of calculation, could be to allocate a significant number of additional homes that could be delivered in South Cambridgeshire in the next five years. Given the nature of the district, the majority of these homes would have to be in villages, as urban extensions or new settlements would require more planning and infrastructure, and this would not be sustainable development in the context of the submitted joint sustainable development strategy for Greater Cambridge. Additionally it is likely to also require the allocation of significantly more dwellings than needed to deliver the Objectively Assessed Need.

---

<sup>34</sup> East Cambridgeshire's Inspector's Interim Conclusions – 14 July 2014 (RD/Strat/310)

<sup>35</sup> Report to East Cambridgeshire District Council by Michael J Hetherington BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI MCIEEM and Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. 9 March 2015 (RD/Strat/311) Paragraphs 19 to 28

52. In order to move the Examination forward expeditiously, confirmation of the acceptability of the approach in principle should be identified at the earliest possible stage.

**PM1B.2**

**Will the use of a joint trajectory assist in meeting the objectives of the Framework, including the delivery of sustainable development and boosting, significantly, the supply of land for housing?**

53. The development strategy proposed by the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans provides a sustainable development strategy for the Greater Cambridge area. These plans will also significantly boost the supply of land for housing by allocating land to meet objectively assessed housing needs and providing a five year housing land supply as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF. The joint housing trajectory reflects that strategy, and is a tool to assist in the securing of sustainable development.
54. The MoU supports the implementation of the development sequence for the Cambridge area, demonstrated to be the most sustainable approach to planning in the sub-region. The benefits of the development strategy provided by the Local Plans are summarised in the Council's Development Strategy Update<sup>36</sup>, in particular paragraph 4.75 states that the preferred strategy:
- *maximises development within the urban area of Cambridge focusing on previously developed land*
  - *includes the existing major developments on the edge of Cambridge identified in the adopted plans through previous Green Belt releases*
  - *releases limited land for development on the edge of Cambridge weighing in each case the sustainability merits of such locations with the significance of harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt*
  - *focuses growth at new settlements on two key strategic growth corridors, supported by transport improvements to achieve sustainable high quality public transport and other infrastructure such as education, with potential to support longer term sustainable growth outside the Green Belt;*
  - *continues to limit the amount of new development in villages whilst providing for new development focused at the more sustainable villages to provide some flexibility to meet local needs*
  - *supports the recycling of land at villages and schemes to meet local needs, with the scale of schemes guided by the rural settlement hierarchy.*
55. The use of a joint housing trajectory avoids short term planning based purely on whether development occurs either side of an administrative boundary on joint sites, helping to secure a sustainable strategy for the Cambridge area which overall delivers development to meet the identified objectively assessed needs and maintains a five year housing land supply. The joint housing trajectory reflects the practicalities of bringing forward committed development and new sites in the Cambridge area.
56. Not applying a joint housing trajectory risks undermining delivery of the Government's sustainability objectives set out in the NPPF. It would encourage a less sustainable strategy to be included in the plans, by increasing supply in less sustainable

---

<sup>36</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Development Strategy Update (November 2015) (RD/MC/060);

locations. Increasing five year land supply in South Cambridgeshire alone would require additional allocations at villages. Sites at villages are likely to be the only locations where development is capable of being delivered quickly enough as they would require less upfront infrastructure. The Development Strategy Update<sup>37</sup> summarises a range of reasons why, based on the Councils' evidence base, these remain correctly at the bottom of the search sequence. The Joint Sustainability Appraisal Addendum confirmed villages are at the bottom of the development sequence<sup>38</sup>, and Chapter 8 confirmed a village focused strategy performed less well against a number of sustainability objectives than other strategies<sup>39</sup>. Achieving significant numbers of additional new homes would require the allocation of sites where the Council has identified appropriate reasons for rejection and in many cases significant negative impacts to sustainability objectives. Allocating a significant level of additional development at villages would clearly provide for further housing supply overall, but the NPPF requirement to boost housing supply must be seen in the context set out in paragraph 47 of the NPPF of meeting objectively assessed needs. Additional village allocations would provide levels of housing well above the housing requirement identified and also compromise delivery of a sustainable development strategy for the area. The level of housing proposed to meet objectively assessed needs would nevertheless in itself result in a boost over the levels of past supply generally achieved in the Cambridge area, and the joint housing trajectory shows anticipated supply in the plan period in excess of objectively assessed need providing flexibility.

57. It would not be part of a sustainable development strategy to provide significantly higher levels of development at villages when suitable sites higher up the development sequence are coming forward for development but that the phasing of those major sites on the edge of Cambridge means that they are providing an oversupply in Cambridge and an undersupply in South Cambridgeshire, simply because of the way those sites are building out from the edge of Cambridge.
58. The other alternative would be new urban extensions to Cambridge, but lead in times of major growth sites would also limit the impact such sites would have on the five year supply. Based on the latest housing trajectory<sup>40</sup>, South Cambridgeshire on its own would be able to demonstrate a five year supply using the Sedgfield methodology and a 20% buffer in 2020. Based on the experience of delivering existing urban extensions, it is unlikely that any new urban extension would be able to contribute significant numbers of homes earlier than this. The Inner Green Belt Study 2015<sup>41</sup> has further demonstrated the significant harm to Green Belt purposes that

---

<sup>37</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Development Strategy Update (November 2015) (RD/MC/060) paragraphs 4.35 to 4.41

<sup>38</sup> Joint Sustainability Appraisal Addendum (RD/MC/021) Chapter 5 (Strategic Development Sequence) section 5.4 and table 5.1.

<sup>39</sup> Joint Sustainability Appraisal Addendum (RD/MC/021) Chapter 7 (Strategic Development Alternatives) sections 7.4 to 7.6

<sup>40</sup> Housing Land Supply Update, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (November 2015) (RD/MC/050), Appendix 4

<sup>41</sup> Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (November 2015) RD/MC/030

would result from this, undermining achievement of the NPPF's objective to protect Green Belt<sup>42</sup>.

59. The NPPF requires LPAs to '*use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework*'. The submitted Local Plans allocate sites which are consistent with the development strategy, whilst further village sites would not be consistent with wider policies in the framework, as it would undermine the achievement of sustainable development.
60. NPPF paragraph 150 states that Local Plans are the key to delivering sustainable development that reflects the vision and aspirations of local communities. As set out in the Councils' Development Strategy Update<sup>43</sup>, the Councils consulted on how the sustainable development strategy should be taken forward for the area. The most favoured option was to focus development on new settlements, in preference to an edge of Cambridge focus or sustainable villages focus.
61. It would be contrary to the submitted sustainable development strategy to allocate additional sites at villages for the purposes of five year supply simply because development is taking place on one part of the Cambridge fringe rather than another.
62. Boosting supply of housing must be considered in the context of meeting objectively assessed needs. The 33,500 new homes in the Local Plan housing requirements will boost significantly the supply of housing in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF. This compares with 27,600 new homes suggested by national household projections, and includes an uplift of 30% for Cambridge and 10% for South Cambridgeshire to take account of market signals.
63. The development strategy for Greater Cambridge is already boosting housing supply in Cambridge, as the delivery of the edge of Cambridge sites has resulted in increased annual completions. The housing trajectory for Cambridge<sup>44</sup> shows that actual annual completions have and predicted annual completions will exceed the average annual requirement of 700 dwellings from 2013-2014 until 2022-2023. By this time, it is anticipated that over 80% of the housing requirement for Cambridge will have been delivered.
64. The submitted Local Plans provide a sustainable development strategy that will also boost housing supply in South Cambridgeshire. The joint sites on the edge of Cambridge are now starting to deliver in South Cambridgeshire, and the first 29 dwellings at Trumpington Meadows in South Cambridgeshire have been completed. The new settlements will also start delivering homes later in the plan period, and the

---

<sup>42</sup> National Planning Policy Framework (RD/NP/010) paragraph 79

<sup>43</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Development Strategy Update (November 2015) (RD/MC/060), paragraph 4.65

<sup>44</sup> Housing Land Supply Update, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (November 2015) (RD/MC/050), Appendix 4

housing trajectory<sup>45</sup> for South Cambridgeshire anticipates that delivery will significantly exceed the average annual requirement of 975 dwellings from 2017-2018 until 2026-2027. By this time, it is anticipated that 90% of the housing requirement for South Cambridgeshire will have been delivered.

65. The housing trajectory<sup>46</sup> for South Cambridgeshire anticipates that overall delivery by 2031 will be higher than the housing requirement of 19,500 dwellings, even based on a cautious approach to anticipated delivery at the new settlements. If the new settlements deliver earlier or faster than predicted in the housing trajectory, as suggested by the promoters, the overall delivery of new homes in South Cambridgeshire will be significantly higher than the housing requirement.
66. The annual average requirement for both Councils in order to provide for their objectively assessed needs will be higher than past delivery rates, and will therefore in itself boost housing supply. The adopted Local Plans proposed a step change in the level of housing delivery in Greater Cambridge, and a change from a dispersed development strategy to a more sustainable development strategy focussing development on the edge of Cambridge through Green Belt releases and at the new settlement at Northstowe. This step change in housing delivery started to be seen in actual completions in both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, however the recession resulted in delays to the major new developments being started and therefore housing completions declined. The allocation of two new settlements will not only make a significant contribution to housing delivery in this plan period but also in the longer term. The housing trajectory has taken a sensible, cautious and realistic approach to these sites, and they may be able to deliver faster if the market allows.
67. The joint housing trajectory will support delivery of the Councils' housing requirements, and both plans are based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs in a sustainable manner thereby boosting housing supply as required by NPPF paragraph 47. The joint housing trajectory reflects the reality of delivering the strategy which includes cross boundary sites, and focuses the supply of housing in sustainable locations.

---

<sup>45</sup> Housing Land Supply Update, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (November 2015) (RD/MC/050), Appendix 4

<sup>46</sup> Housing Land Supply Update, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (November 2015) (RD/MC/050), Appendix 4

**PM1B.3**

**Is it clear how this approach would work in practice; i.e how would the five year land supply would be calculated and updated; and it is clear how any failure to provide a five year supply would be resolved?**

68. The two Councils will work together under the duty to co-operate to ensure that the joint housing trajectory and five year supply calculated across both areas will work in practice. The Councils set out the practical operation of the MoU in the supplement to their statement to matter 8<sup>47</sup>.
69. The Councils consider that it is clear how the joint five year land supply would be calculated and updated. Both Councils are committed to the Joint Housing Trajectory. Proposed Modifications (PM/CC2/C and PM/SC/2/B) would clearly establish in the Local Plans that the housing trajectories for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, as updated each year in the Annual Monitoring Report, will be considered together for the purposes of phasing of housing delivery, including for calculating five year housing land supply in development management decisions of both Councils that concern housing development.
70. If a shortfall arises, the two Councils will both be in a situation where they accept they cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The consequence would be that the housing supply policies in both plans would be considered out of date for the purposes of paragraph 49 of the NPPF, and paragraph 14 of the NPPF would come into effect.
71. The Councils would work together under the duty to co-operate to determine how any shortfall would be overcome. This would include considering whether a review or partial review of the Local Plans is needed, if a shortfall arose before 2019 when the Councils are already committed to start work on a joint Local Plan under the City Deal agreement.
72. The joint trajectory approach is already being put into practice. Since the completion of the MoU, the Councils' respective Annual Monitoring Reports have included a joint housing trajectory and calculation of a joint five year housing land supply, and this would continue.
73. The joint five year supply has been calculated using the total housing requirement for the Greater Cambridge area and the total actual and predicted completions. For completeness, calculations have currently been made using both a Liverpool and Sedgfield methodology and a 5% and 20% buffer. The final calculation would depend on the outcome of the Examination, and determination of the appropriate method and buffer in each district.
74. If it is concluded that a different buffer and / or methodology should be applied for each Council, the joint five year supply would be calculated by determining the five year supply requirement for each Council individually (using the relevant methodology

---

<sup>47</sup> Matter 8 – Housing Land Supply and Delivery - Councils' Position Statement on Main Modifications (M8/CCC&SCDC) to reflect the Memorandum of Understanding (RD/EX/070) – paragraphs 12 to 14

and buffer) and then adding the requirements for the two Councils together. The identified deliverable housing supply for the Greater Cambridge area within the five year period can then be compared to the total five year supply requirement for the Greater Cambridge area to conclude whether the Councils can jointly demonstrate a five year supply.

**PM1B.4**

**The Memorandum of Understanding (RD/Strat/350) indicated that, as part of the City Deal arrangements, the Councils have agreed to prepare a joint Local Plan and Transport Strategy starting in 2019. Should this commitment be expressly included in the Local Plans?**

75. The Greater Cambridge City Deal (RD/Strat/300) states that '*local partners are committed to an early review of their local plans beginning in 2019*<sup>48</sup>. This is reflected in paragraph 6i of the Memorandum of Understanding (RD/Strat/350). This commitment was made after the Local Plans were submitted. As stated in the Proposed Modifications – Report on Consultation<sup>49</sup>, the Councils would not object to a reference to this effect in the Local Plans, but do not consider it necessary in order to make the plans sound.
76. The change suggested by Commercial Estates Group (CEG)<sup>50</sup> goes significantly further than this, by proposing an adoption deadline for a joint Local Plan (of 2020), which they say is in order to specifically activate the potential for soundness conditional on an early review as described in NPPG Reference ID: 12-008-20140306.
77. The Councils' intention to prepare a joint Local Plan was not proposed with the aim of activating this clause, but reflects commitments to joint planning made through the City Deal. The imposition of an adoption date as proposed by CEG, in effect providing a sunset clause for the plan, is wholly inappropriate and unworkable.
78. Their suggested policy also proposes that the review of the plans should include a further assessment of the inner Green Belt boundary. The Councils consider it would be premature to conclude and require now that an inner Green Belt review will be required at the time the proposed joint local plan is prepared, as this would be a matter to consider in the scoping of the next plan, and whether it was appropriate at that time.
79. The Councils therefore oppose the inclusion of the policy proposed by Commercial Estates Group.

---

<sup>48</sup> Greater Cambridge City Deal (RD/Strat/300) page 6

<sup>49</sup> Proposed Modifications – Report on Consultation (March 2016) (RD/MC/120), Appendix A, PM/CC/2/G & PM/SC/2/R

<sup>50</sup> Proposed Modifications Representations - South Cambridgeshire: 66015 Cambridge: 65998

## **Appendix 1: List of Reference Documents**

The Councils' evidence in relation to Matter PM1: Housing is set out in the following documents:

### **General:**

- Letter from the Inspectors to the Councils dated 20 May 2015 regarding Preliminary Conclusions (RD/GEN/170)

### **National Policy:**

- National Planning Policy Framework (RD/NP/010)
- National Planning Practice Guidance (RD/NP/020)

### **Committee Reports and Minutes:**

- Report on Proposals for developing the next stages of the Greater Cambridge City Deal transport programme and city centre congestion - City Deal Joint Assembly 6 March 2015 (RD/CR/145)

### **Development Strategy:**

- Population, Housing and Employment Forecasts Technical Report (April 2013) (RD/Strat/080)
- Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (May 2013) (RD/Strat/090)
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation: Supporting the Spatial Approach 2011-2031 (May 2013) (RD/Strat/100)
- Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, University of Cambridge, Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership – Greater Cambridge City Deal (RD/Strat/300)
- East Cambridgeshire's Inspector's Interim Conclusions – 14 July 2014 (RD/Strat/310)
- Report to East Cambridgeshire District Council by Michael J Hetherington BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI MCIEEM and Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. 9 March 2015 (RD/Strat/311)
- Appeal Decision: APP/W0530/A/13/2207961 Land to the west of Cody Road, Waterbeach, Cambridge, CB25 9LS. June 2014 (RD/Strat/330)
- Appeal Decision: APP/W0530/A/13/2209166 Land north of Bannold Road, Waterbeach, Cambridgeshire. June 2014 (RD/Strat/340)
- Memorandum of Understanding between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council: Greater Cambridge Joint Housing Trajectory September 2014 (RD/Strat/350)

### **Transport and Infrastructure:**

- Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (March 2014) (RD/T/120)

### **Statements of Common Ground**

- Statement of Common and Uncommon Ground regarding Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) (RD/SCG/430)

**Modifications Consultation:**

- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans SA Addendum Report (November 2015) (Revised) (RD/MC/021)
- Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (November 2015) (RD/MC/030)
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence (November 2015) (RD/MC/040)
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Responses to Objectors (March 2016) (RD/MC/041)
- Housing Land Supply Update, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (November 2015) (RD/MC/050)
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Development Strategy Update (November 2015) (RD/MC/060)
- Proposed Modifications – Report on Consultation (March 2016) (RD/MC/120)
- Cambridge Proposed Modifications (March 2016) (RD/MC/140)
- South Cambridgeshire Proposed Modifications (March 2016) (RD/MC/150)

**Hearing Statements:**

- M8 – CCC & SCDC – Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Matter Statement for Matter 8
- Matter 8 – Housing Land Supply and Delivery - Councils' Position Statement on Main Modifications (M8/CCC&SCDC) to reflect the Memorandum of Understanding (RD/EX/070)