

APPENDIX 4: ANALYSIS OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS

This section should be read in conjunction with the Local Plan Issues and Options Report.

3. Development Needs

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

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

inputs to predict change in sectors more directly associated with population growth such as retailing, education, health and construction. Notwithstanding, there is little material difference between the outputs from both these scenarios with the baseline forecasts only 700 fewer jobs over the next 20 years.

The work concludes that the earlier forecasts had been more pessimistic than necessary and the number of jobs has stood up in the Cambridge area better than had been anticipated. In fact, there was an overall growth in jobs approaching 4,000 between 2008 and 2011, even though there was a short term dip in total jobs in 2010. Overall, employment numbers have proved fairly resilient with employers opting for shorter hours and reduced pay rather than wholesale redundancies.

The rate of jobs growth is still predicted to be much slower than had been predicted at the time of the last round of plan making. Over the last 20 years 1991-2011, the total number of jobs has increased from 68,400 to 81,300 amounting to an additional 31,500 jobs (46.1%). The increase averaged 1,600 additional jobs per annum over the same period, although it dropped to around 1,000 per annum during the recession 2008-2011.

Looking at the forecasts for jobs growth over the next 20 year period 2011-2031, the model predicts that they will increase from 81,300 to 104,400 amounting to an additional 23,100 jobs, an increase of 28.4%. The increase assumes an average of 1,200 jobs per annum over the 20 years of the plan period. This is therefore lower than the rate of increase in jobs over the last 20 years. This is to be expected given the Cambridge Cluster is now maturing. South Cambridgeshire is still projected to be the fastest growing district in Cambridgeshire.

The rate of increase predicted as the area responds to and recovers from the recession over the next 10 years is around 1,000 additional jobs per annum, so reflecting steady performance during the recession so far. The annual rate of increase is predicted to pick up during the following 10 year period to an average of 1,300 per annum leading up to 2031. The past performance in the district, the way it has withstood the worst effects of the recession suggest that the predictions are a reasonable estimate of future performance, given the inherent uncertainty at the present time.

The model's annual average UK GDP growth rates used in the baseline are as follows:

2001 - 2011 1.4% pa
2011 - 2021 2.6% pa
2021 - 2031 2.4% pa

This view of the UK economy comes from a forecast produced in the LEFM UK sectoral model. The county and district projections, which are the outputs of LEFM, assume that historical relationships

	<p>between a given area and the East of England or UK (depending upon which area's historical results show it has the strongest relationship with) continue into the future. As such, the baseline reflects projections for the local areas taking into account the forecast at the time for the UK and the regions. The outputs are local economic performance against this modelled national growth rate. The 2001 – 2011 average of 1.4% includes the severe recessionary effects during 2008 and 2009.</p> <p>The model also looks at what would happen locally if the national economy performed a bit better or worse than expected (i.e. that GDP were to be higher or lower than anticipated by +/- 0.5%). The low and high scenarios alter the national position (and consequently the East of England position) and measure the impacts upon the projections at the local area level.</p> <p>The low growth scenario suggests that the rate of increase in jobs could fall as low as 700 jobs per annum, or a total increase of 14,000 jobs over the plan period. This is an extremely pessimistic forecast and most likely would only become reality if there were some prolonged turmoil in international markets over a number of years. This rate of growth is lower than achieved during the recession.</p> <p>The high growth scenario suggests that the rate of increase in jobs could rise to as much as 1,500 jobs per annum or an increase of 29,200 jobs. Whilst this isn't as high as the rate achieved over the last 20 years, it would be extremely optimistic given the natural slow down in growth of the Cambridge Cluster at this stage in its development, even if there were major changes in economic policy locally. It also seems unrealistic given the current state of the economy and the broadly accepted expectations that it will take some considerable time to recover from the recession.</p> <p>Alternative new forecasts are provided by the East of England Forecasting Model (EEFM). Both models are complex and straightforward comparison is not easy. Forecasters advise that each model should be regarded as 'a view' on the local economy, neither 'right' and both offer perspectives and insights that ought to be considered in light of local knowledge.</p> <p>The key differences in the EEFM forecasts are that they predict overall that growth in the county will be lower than the LEFM, 82,100 jobs compared with 96,200, but that growth in South Cambridgeshire will be slightly higher than LEFM predicts, 24,800 jobs compared with 23,100. The EEFM forecasts for South Cambridgeshire are baseline: 24,800 jobs, lost decade: 16,800 jobs, and high growth: 31,300 jobs. The rate of growth over the next 20 years also varies. EEFM predicts a faster recovery (1.7%) and then a slower rate of growth (0.9%), whilst LEFM predicts a slower recovery (1.2%) and faster rate of growth later in the plan period (1.3%). Both models see South Cambridgeshire as the fastest growing district.</p>
--	---

	<p>In the past, there have been particular concerns expressed by the Cambridgeshire local authorities with regard to the modelled outputs from EEFM. The latest model run is not greatly different from the LEFM over the 20 year period, although the predictions for the speed at which the economy will recover seem particularly optimistic in the EEFM even given the performance over the downturn. It is positive that models predict strong future growth for South Cambridgeshire. The Council has previously concluded that the LEFM model is the most robust for the local area and, on balance, continues to take that view.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The LEFM predicted jobs increases for the low growth scenario, the Alternative Demography scenario, and the high growth scenarios, are considered to provide the most reasonable options for low, medium and high target options for additional jobs.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 3: How much new employment do you consider the Local Plan should provide for?</p> <p>i) Lower jobs growth – 14,000 additional jobs over the Plan period (700 jobs per year) ii) Medium jobs growth - 23,100 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,200 jobs per year) iii) High jobs growth - 29,200 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,500 jobs per year)</p>

Issue 4	Housing Provision
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 2010 - 2011 • East of England Forecasting Model 2012 – Cambridgeshire County Council
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD: ST/3 Re-Using Previously Developed Land and Buildings • Development Control Policies DPD: DP/1 Sustainable Development
Analysis	<p>The NPPF says that plans should make every effort to objectively identify and then meet housing needs, taking account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.</p> <p>It clarifies that to boost the supply of housing, Local Plans should meet the full, objectively assessed needs of market and affordable housing in the housing market area, including identifying key sites that are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.</p> <p>A key issue for the new Local Plan will be the appropriate level of new housing development that should be planned to come forward over the next 20 years.</p> <p>The current LDF and the Cambridge Local Plan propose sufficient</p>

	<p>housing for the needs of the current population and to support the anticipated increase in jobs which is likely to result in people moving into the Cambridge area. For the new Local Plans to only provide for new jobs would perpetuate the imbalance between homes and jobs in and close to Cambridge and the congestion and emissions that arise from traffic travelling to those jobs.</p> <p>Recent plans for South Cambridgeshire have included relatively high levels of growth, reflecting the success of the Cambridge Cluster and the aim to provide more housing close to jobs in and close to Cambridge. The housing target in the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy, reflecting that in the Structure Plan 2003, is 20,000 new homes between 1999 and 2016. This required an average of 1,176 dwellings per year to be delivered. This was reflected in the annual rate to 2021 in the East of England Plan 2008 of 1,175 dwellings per year, but was more than the draft East of England Plan >2031 rate of 1,050 dwellings per year, which was based on more recent forecasting and taking account of the beginning of the downturn.</p> <p>Looking back over housing completions over the last 20 years since 1999, the average annual rate achieved was 694 dwellings. However, it is not appropriate to directly compare past delivery rates with proposed rates as the development strategy was very different at that time. The 2004 Local Plan covered the period 1991 to 2006 and proposed an annual rate of housing delivery of 753 dwellings per year (11,300 over the 15 year period), so delivery was relatively close to the planned housing levels. The current plan therefore proposed a step change in the rate of housebuilding. Within the past 20 year period there has been a lot of fluctuation in the annual number of completions, reflecting a number of economic cycles and changing development strategies. However, it is of note that with the current development strategy being adopted in 2007, completions reached their highest levels in 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 of 924 and 1,274 dwellings respectively, just before the recession hit. This was also before the new major sites had come forward and more consistently higher completion rates can be expected once they are delivering housing on site. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that higher rates of development could be completed than over the last 20 years with appropriate allocations and market conditions over the period as a whole.</p> <p>Forecasts for natural population growth over the plan period would require an additional 8,400 dwellings to be built (420 per annum). However, this would not provide for even the lowest level of jobs growth predicted and would therefore not support the economy and could either stifle economic growth or lead to increased commuting through the district with adverse impacts on sustainable growth.</p> <p>The Council's preferred forecasting model (Cambridge Econometrics Local Economic Forecasting Model) does not provide forecasts for new housing to go with the forecast new jobs. Population is an input to the model, which has an impact on the</p>
--	--

	<p>population related jobs such as in retail and education, but has limited implications for wider jobs forecasts. However, the alternative forecasting model that has also recently been produced is the East of England Forecasting Model (EEFM) and that does include forecasts of the dwelling numbers needed to support the forecast jobs.</p> <p>The 'baseline' EEFM forecasts predict that 21,400 new dwellings would be required to support the predicted baseline jobs, which are slightly higher than the medium target in the jobs target options. However, as the dwellings number included in the East of England Plan was informed by the earlier Cambridgeshire Development Study forecasts which were lower than now predicted, it is considered reasonable to take that dwellings number, rounded to the nearest 500, giving 21,500 dwellings as a medium housing growth option.</p> <p>If higher levels of jobs growth were to take place in South Cambridgeshire, there would need to be commensurate higher levels of housing growth if the imbalance between jobs and homes were not to be exacerbated. The EEFM concludes that 23,700 dwellings would be required to support the high jobs scenario, which rounded gives 23,500 dwellings as a high housing growth option.</p> <p>The EEFM forecast for dwelling numbers to support the low jobs forecast is very similar to the baseline. The consultants explain this as being because whilst in-migration nationally has fallen with the recession, it is expected to rise again. The change in population under this scenario is much less severe compared with the jobs change, and recent economic conditions do not appear to have had as strong an impact on migration levels as they would have expected. They say a similar impact on migration is observed in the East region in this scenario. Since population is only lower by 19,000 people by 2031, the spread across 48 local authorities means that overall impact at a local authority level by 2031 will be relatively low compared to jobs impacts.</p> <p>Whilst this may make sense in terms of modelling, the Council questions whether those assumptions are reasonable for South Cambridgeshire, where a relatively high proportion of the demand for new housing is for people moving to the district to take up the jobs created. If the jobs are not created there is not the local need to provide additional housing beyond the high levels already needed to support the planned and any forecast new jobs. The Council therefore rejects the EEFM dwelling figure as an appropriate option for consultation.</p> <p>The Council considers that the best available information to draw on for a housing figure to support the low growth jobs figure, is to use the ONS population forecasts which are trend based. It is considered reasonable that the past rate of growth will continue, simply having regard to the current development strategy and</p>
--	--

	<p>existing supply of housing land, even if the rate of jobs increase were to drop significantly. This would continue to help support the Cambridge Cluster and the balance between jobs and homes close to Cambridge. The ONS population forecasts therefore represent a low option for housing growth. Converting the ONS population forecasts into housing requirements has been done by the County Council Research Group using its local model that takes account of the characteristics of the local population and household formation rates. That results in a low growth housing option for new housing of approximately 18,500 or an average of 925 dwellings per annum. This is higher than the average over the previous 20 years but that average does not take account of the higher levels of growth now planned for in current plans, including land on the edge of Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe.</p> <p>In setting the overall housing target, it is relevant to consider the high level of need in the district that exists for affordable housing and is predicted to be required over the plan period. As set out in Chapter 9: Delivering High Quality Homes, there is a need for 15,049 affordable housing over the plan period. Housing developments are the key source of providing new affordable housing, with other sources such as exceptions sites and other schemes by social housing providers being more limited in terms of absolute numbers of new affordable homes, although their local benefits are important. Using the current requirement for 40% of new housing to be affordable, none of the target options for new housing would fully meet the anticipated locally arising needs over the plan period.</p> <p>The options for housing growth need to be considered in the context of the current development strategy and the amount of housing that already has planning permission or is allocated for housing development in current plans. The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) 2010-2011 includes a housing trajectory that shows that at the end of March 2011 there were 2,897 dwellings with planning permission. It also showed 12,926 dwellings allocated for development in current plans that were predicted to have been built by 2031, giving a total supply of 15,823. It is important to be as realistic as possible about the delivery of housing from current proposals so that sufficient housing land is allocated to meet housing needs. Within this context, it is considered reasonable to continue to rely on the majority of the current allocations to have been completed by 2031. However, the AMR figure has been revised to 11,300 dwellings to reflect changes in circumstances in relation to 2 major sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northstowe – A delay in the start of completions in the first phase of development at Northstowe compared with the AMR housing trajectory but reflecting that the outline planning application has now been received and is due to be determined by the end of 2012. This has the effect of reducing the amount of the new town that is anticipated to be built by 2031 to approximately 7,500 dwellings with the remaining 2,000 dwellings coming after that date. This is the only development in current plans that is expected to continue providing housing
--	---

	<p>after 2031.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge East - The revised figure excludes land North of Newmarket Road given current uncertainty about the delivery of that site, which will be explored through the plan making process. No allowance has been made for any development at Cambridge Airport. Cambridge East is covered in detail in Chapter 13: Site Specific Issues. <p>Taking permissions and latest predicted delivery from allocations together gives a total housing supply of 14,200 that will go towards each of the housing targets.</p> <p>The housing trajectory will be reviewed in detail with developers and landowners before the draft plan is prepared as part of the preparation of the next Annual Monitoring Report and will take account of any other changes in circumstance, in particular the effects on development timetables of the expected Government announcement over the summer in relation to improvements to the A14.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: It is considered that there are 3 reasonable alternative options for housing growth: low, medium and high. These relate to the corresponding amount of new jobs forecast in the low, medium and high jobs growth options. The options are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low housing growth option: 18,500 dwellings (925 dwellings per year) – existing growth plus sites for 4,300 dwellings • Medium housing growth option: 21,500 dwellings (1,075 dwellings per year) – existing growth plus sites for 7,300 dwellings • High housing growth option: 23,500 dwellings (1,175 dwellings per year) – existing growth plus sites for 9,300 dwellings
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 4: A. How much new housing do you consider the Local Plan should provide for?</p> <p>i) Lower housing growth - additional 4,300 dwellings (equal to 925 dwellings per year) ii) Medium housing growth - additional 6,800 dwellings (equates to 1,050 dwellings per year) iii) High housing growth - additional 9,300 dwellings (equate to 1,175 dwellings per year)</p> <p>B. Do you agree with the assumption for delivery of housing at Northstowe of approximately 500 homes per year?</p>

Issue 5	Windfall Allowance
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment • Annual Monitoring Report 2010 - 2011
Existing policies	n/a
Analysis	The National Planning Policy Framework says that an allowance may be made for windfall sites in the 5-year supply if local planning authorities have compelling evidence that such sites

have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance must be realistic having regard to the SHLAA, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens.

Windfall development is housing that comes forward on land that is not specifically allocated in Plans. The NPPF now amplifies that it does not include development on residential gardens. However, it does allow an allowance to be included in housing land supply calculations again, having been dropped in the last round of national guidance.

The Council argued when preparing the current plan that it could demonstrate a steady supply of windfalls over a long period of time and that the plan policies allowing development on unallocated land to come forward within village frameworks where certain tests were met would see this trend continue. Under national policy at that time, the Inspectors were not persuaded that there were the necessary exceptional circumstances required to allow such an approach.

The change in the NPPF means that it is now appropriate to revisit the issue of windfalls and potentially include an allowance for such development.

All windfalls have averaged over 200 dwellings per year for many years.

Windfall Housing Completions Since 1991

Time Period	Windfalls
1999-2001 *	396
2001-2002 **	186
2002-2003	222
2003-2004	190
2004-2005	194
2005-2006	not known
2006-2007	236
2007-2008	551
2008-2009	216
2009-2010	319

Source: SCDC Monitoring/Cambridgeshire County Council Monitoring

* this covers the period from July 1999 to June 2001.

** this covers the period from July 2001 to March 2002.

The remaining years are financial years.

There is a fairly consistent number of windfall sites that come forward every year. This is an average of 251 dwellings per annum over the 10 years (if 2005-2006 is excluded from the calculations). No account has so far been taken in this monitoring information to identify how many of those windfall dwellings were on garden land.

	<p>There will be some, but equally some windfall sites are redevelopment of brownfield land for example. A review of the windfall sites will be undertaken to identify how many meet the NPPF definition of windfall and the case for a windfall allowance considered further.</p> <p>The case for a windfall allowance will also be affected by the policies that are chosen to be included in the new Local Plan that will allow windfall development to come forward. The more flexible they are the greater the case for a windfall allowance and vice versa.</p> <p>The amount of new housing land that would need to be allocated in the new Plan would be reduced if a windfall allowance is included in the Plan.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: To include a windfall allowance or not, depending on the refined evidence in respect of garden land.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 5: Do you consider that the Plan should include an allowance for windfall development?

Issue 6	Providing a 5-year land supply
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Monitoring Report 2010 - 2011
Existing policies	No specific policy – addressed through Annual Monitoring Report
Analysis	<p>The NPPF carries forward the national requirement that Councils must identify and update annually a 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites. This is done through Annual Monitoring Reports. The NPPF also introduces a requirement to provide “an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land”. It goes on to say that “where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land” (paragraph 47). Issues for the Plan are therefore to ensure a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land is provided, and to consider whether the Council needs to demonstrate a buffer of 5% or 20% against its 5-year supply.</p> <p>It is fair to acknowledge that the Council has not had a 5-year housing land supply since the LDF was adopted. It was anticipated at the time of preparing the current strategy that the plan would not deliver the anticipated average annual rate in the first part of the plan period and that it would not be until the major sites came forward later in the plan period that the annual rate would be met and then exceeded to achieve the overall levels of housing development. The rate of completions very much reflected this anticipated trend although the major sites took a little longer to come forward than anticipated at the beginning of the plan making</p>

	<p>process but were building up to, and just before the recession exceeding, the necessary annual rates.</p> <p>It is therefore a matter of debate whether the Council can be regarded as having a record of “persistent under delivery”. The Council considers that comment is aimed particularly at Councils that failed to prepare plans to meet their local needs, not Councils such as South Cambridgeshire District Council who were amongst the first to embrace and prepare Local Development Frameworks and fully plan for their local needs. Whichever buffer is provided for, the Council recognises the importance of taking on board the lessons of implementing the current development strategy, particularly in difficult market conditions, and a key issue will be to provide sufficient flexibility in the range, size, type and location of housing allocations to provide a more robust strategy that can better withstand potentially changing market conditions.</p> <p>The amount of housing identified as deliverable over the following 5-years 2012 - 2017 in the last AMR is 5,606 dwellings. Amending the figures for Northstowe and removing North of Newmarket Road for consistency with the land supply approach in the issue above, this gives a supply of 4,746. This does not include any estimate for windfalls which would increase the supply if included.</p> <p>This compares with a 5-year requirement under the lower target option of 4,625, under the medium target option of 5,375 and under the high target option of 5,875 dwellings. A 5% buffer would be 231, 269, and 294 dwellings respectively. A 20% buffer, effectively an additional year, would be 925, 1075 and 1175 dwellings respectively. An issue for the plan will therefore be to ensure that the allocations in the new plan are capable of being delivered to ensure that the 5-year supply is met and that an appropriate level of buffer is provided that is flexible enough to be able to be brought forward from the later part of the plan period if monitoring of supply demonstrates that this is necessary. The NPPF does not suggest that the buffer is made up of additional allocations above the total target.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: To include a 5% or 20% buffer to ensure a 5-year housing land supply.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 6: What level of 5-year land supply buffer do you think the Council should plan for that would be capable of being brought forward from later in the plan period?</p> <p>i) 5% buffer; or ii) 20% buffer.</p>

4. Spatial Strategy

Issue 7	Localism and Relationship with Neighbourhood Development Plans
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Planning Policy Framework 2012 • Localism Act 2011
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision, Values and The Three As - South Cambridgeshire District Council (2012) • South Cambridgeshire Statement of Community Involvement (2010)
Analysis	<p>The Localism Act 2011 creates new responsibilities and opportunities for local communities to be actively involved in planning. The District Council wishes to engage positively with local communities in the preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and that local planning authorities should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see. To support this, local planning authorities should aim to involve all sections of the community in the development of Local Plans and in planning decisions, and should facilitate neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>The NPPF provides a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities. Neighbourhood Plans have to be consistent with the strategic policies in the current Local Development Framework and, when adopted, the new Local Plan. Neighbourhood Development Plans are optional but Parishes can use them to make their own development proposals if they wish. It is intended that the new Local Plan will be closely aligned with local opinion and will be supported so that time and resources are not required to develop separate neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The Council will engage with Parish Councils during the Issues and Options consultation to explore ways of meeting local aspirations through the new Local Plan and wishes to hear from local communities how they think this can best be achieved.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 7: Do you think local aspirations can be reflected in the Local Plan?</p> <p>If yes, how can this best be done? If no, why do you take that view?</p>
Issue 8	Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 20010/11
Existing policies	<p>Core Strategy DPD: ST/3 Re-Using Previously Developed Land and Buildings</p> <p>Development Control Policies DPD: DP/1 Sustainable</p>

	Development
Analysis	<p>The NPPF refers to the United Nations General Assembly’s widely used definition of sustainable development as ‘meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’. It also refers to the UK Sustainable Development Strategy’s 5 guiding principles. It states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Local Plans are required to meet objectively assessed needs with sufficient flexibility to response to rapid change and to follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development that is sustainable can be approved without delay.</p> <p>The three strands of sustainability are all addressed throughout the issues and options for the Local Plan and sustainable development is an overarching principle underpinning the plan.</p> <p>The Council’s integrated approach to sustainability appraisal and policy assessment has also been adopted so that sustainability considerations are at the heart of the plan.</p> <p>A particular aspect of sustainable development not captured elsewhere is the reuse of previously developed land. The NPPF says that planning policies should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. It says that local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has a policy for brownfield land that includes a target. However, that policy was included specifically because the Structure Plan included a target for each district in the County. The Council argued at the time of the Structure Plan that it is difficult to set a target for South Cambridgeshire given the relatively limited number of brownfield land sites and that those that were included for development such as Cambridge Airport and Oakington Barracks (part of the Northstowe site) were very much dependent on the phasing of major developments and which parts of those long term developments would come forward in the plan period and which beyond. The same principle applies for the new Local Plan. It is therefore not considered reasonable to include a target in the plan, given the uncertainty of delivery of previously developed land against such a target. The local plan could include a policy that focuses development on previously developed land as a matter of principle, where it is not of high environmental value, and bringing that together with the presumption in favour of sustainable development to say that reuse of PDL should be where it is in sustainable locations.</p>

	<p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: It is not considered reasonable to include any alternative options, given the pre-eminence of sustainable development in national planning policy, other than in the case of whether to have a specific policy on previously developed land.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 8: Do you think the Local Plan should include a specific policy focusing development on the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, where the land is not of high environmental value?</p>

Issue 9	Development Strategy
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire Development Study (2009)- Consultants WSP in association with Pegasus Planning, SQW Consulting and Cambridge Econometrics • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) – Updated chapters up to 2011.- Cambridgeshire Horizons • South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11
Existing policies	Core Strategy DPD: ST/2 Housing Provision; ST/4 Rural Centres: ST/5 Minor Rural Centres; ST/6 Group Villages; ST/7 Infill Villages.
Analysis	<p>The Current Development Strategy</p> <p>The current development strategy for the Cambridge area was originally conceived in the Regional Plan for East Anglia in 2000 and confirmed and refined in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the East of England Plan 2008. The first two plans have now fallen away with the last expected to be abolished by Government soon. The current strategy for the district is provided by the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework documents adopted between 2007 and 2010.</p> <p>A significant number of new jobs have been created in and close to Cambridge over the last 20 years. New jobs will need new employees and the aim has been to provide as a greater number of new homes than previously as close to the jobs in and around Cambridge as possible, with the aim of providing a better balance between jobs and homes in and close to Cambridge, to help reduce commuting and congestion and providing a more sustainable pattern of development. That has resulted in high levels of planned growth in both employment and housing in South Cambridgeshire, and the expectation of significant in-migration into the district to provide the new workers to support the new jobs; 80% at the time of the Structure Plan. This also reflects the physical and environmental constraints on Cambridge in providing enough housing to support the local economy, and some of the housing growth in South Cambridgeshire is to help provide that better balance.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy ST/2 identifies a development sequence that aims to provide sustainable patterns of development. It focuses first on Cambridge, then extensions to Cambridge on land now released from the Green Belt, followed by the new town</p>

of Northstowe with its links to Cambridge via the Guided Busway. It then looks to the market towns elsewhere in the County and only finally looks to more sustainable rural locations, described as Rural Centres and other villages. Policies ST/4, ST/5 ST/6 and ST/7 then define a rural settlement hierarchy categorising villages from the more sustainable to the least sustainable (this is reviewed at Issue 13).

The development sequence approach is so that residents of new housing will be close to jobs, services and facilities and also have the opportunity to use sustainable methods of transport to access them. As part of the last round of plan making, the Green Belt around Cambridge was reviewed and a number of releases were made to provide new communities on the edge of the City. These included land in South Cambridgeshire at Trumpington Meadows, sites both sides of Huntingdon Road in North West Cambridge, Cambridge East, and potential for additional housing at Orchard Park.

This focus on urban development resulted in a move away from the previous dispersed development strategy, which had seen relatively high levels of growth in South Cambridgeshire's villages over a number of decades. The current strategy has very little growth currently planned in villages, although windfall development is provided for within villages of appropriate scales depending on their relative sustainability.

Development Strategy to 2031

A key issue for the new Local Plan will be whether the current development strategy remains the most appropriate strategy for the district or whether any alternative strategies should be considered to provide whatever levels of growth are chosen.

Cambridge City Council is also reviewing its current Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and preparing a new Local Plan for the period to 2031. In view of the close relationships between the two districts, and the new duty to cooperate enshrined in national legislation, the Councils are working together on issues of shared interest, including the development strategy.

The NPPF continues and adds to the emphasis on sustainable development. The principle of providing a better balance between jobs that form part of the Cambridge Cluster in and around to Cambridge and homes close to provide a more sustainable pattern of development that provides the opportunity for more people to live close to where they work and reduce travel, congestion and emissions in the area remains sound.

The current housing-led and mixed use allocations are anticipated to generally remain appropriate. The new Local Plan will need to be sure that in carrying forward any current allocations that they remain suitable, available and deliverable.

In particular, the implications of Marshall deciding to stay at Cambridge Airport will need to be considered, as Cambridge East will not now be developed, meaning that a key element of the strategy has been lost that would have provided land for about 7,500 dwellings in South Cambridgeshire and a strategic location for new employment, and the approach to any development at Cambridge East, including any land that could come forward without the Airport relocating is an issue for the plan, is dealt with in chapter 13.

The current development strategy is best described as urban focused, with very limited new development for housing or employment located at villages. The few housing allocations that were carried forward has largely now been developed and rural development is mainly limited to completing the new village of Cambourne, making best use of brownfield sites, such as Bayer Crop Science and Ida Darwin Hospital, and windfall development within village frameworks compatible with their place in the rural settlement hierarchy. However, the urban focus is shared between Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe, in view of the limitation there was considered to be on releasing more land from the Green Belt compatible with Green Belt purposes.

The development strategy moving forwards needs to be flexible to deal with potentially rapidly changing circumstances, particularly taking account of the unusual market conditions that exist at the time of writing the plan, the wider international uncertainties, and the challenges of predicting the economy of the country and locally over the next few years, let alone the next 20 years.

The Council considers that within the wider framework of sustainable development set by the NPPF, the options for the focus of the development strategy continue to be to:

- Focus more development on the edge of Cambridge – this is the most sustainable location in South Cambridgeshire and has best access to services, facilities and jobs. The loss of Cambridge East has significantly reduced the supply of housing land on the edge of Cambridge for the new Local Plan. The question exists whether a further review of the Green Belt should be undertaken, and this is addressed in a separate issue below.
- Focus more development through one or more new settlement – this would be the next most sustainable option available to the Council in terms of the opportunity to provide a scale of development that could provide a significant level of local services and facilities (in particular be large enough to support a secondary school) and have the critical mass needed to provide potential for enhanced high quality public transport links to Cambridge, similar to the service the Guided Busway will provide for Northstowe.
- Focus on development at the more sustainable villages that

	<p>have the best levels of services and facilities and accessibility by public transport and cycle to Cambridge and to a lesser extent to a market town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A combination of the above. <p>In considering development at villages, the focus on sustainable villages is guided by the presumption in the NPPF on sustainable development, which means that the search for site options for consultation will start at the most sustainable locations in the district and move down the sequence which becomes less sustainable at each stage. As in the current development strategy, there will be no need to look further down the development sequence for site options than necessary to provide sufficient choice of site options from which to draw the preferred set of sites for allocation for housing development following consultation. The identification of site options is therefore focused on the larger, better served villages. These are identified in Issue 13.</p> <p>The site options are considered at Issue 16. They have been informed by the site assessments carried out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). These assessments have been brought together and an overall assessment carried out of their potential for housing. The assessment has been carried out and published for all SHLAA sites received, including for all Group villages. In the event, Issue 16 concludes that site options exist in the more sustainable larger villages to provide sufficient flexibility to identify sites to meet the housing target options being consulted on, and no site options at Group villages (those not proposed for upgrade at Issue 13) have been put forward for consultation.</p> <p>The Council is aware that some smaller villages have indicated that they would like to see some additional development. The Council wishes to explore the issue through this consultation, particularly through Issue 7: Localism and Relationship with Development Plans, Issue 14: Scale of Development at Villages and Issue 15: Approach to Village Frameworks.</p> <p>Depending on the results of consultation on the housing target dealt with earlier in this chapter and the site options contained in Chapter 5: Development Options, Issue 13, some options for the development strategy may prove not to be possible to deliver because not enough suitable site options have been identified that have the focus identified. If that proves to be the case, the Council will need to reach a judgement on the most appropriate balance between those factors.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 9: What do you think is the best approach to the development strategy for South Cambridgeshire? All options are expected to need to involve some village development to provide flexibility and early housing provision:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Cambridge focus (would require a review of the Green Belt) ii. New Settlement focus iii. Sustainable Villages focus (would require a review of the Green Belt) iv. Combination of the above
--	---

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

	<p>found sound. The Council considers they remain a sound definition of the Green Belt purposes and functions. However, this is an opportunity to consult widely to confirm whether these are remain the most appropriate for the new Local Plan.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives No alternatives have been identified, but given the significance of the Green Belt, it is relevant to consult on whether there is any case to change the purposes and functions of the Green Belt.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 10: Do you think that the Green Belt purposes and functions remain appropriate for the new Plan?

Issue 11	Considering Exceptional Circumstances for a Green Belt review
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridge Green Belt Study - Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core Strategy DPD:ST/1 Green Belt; ST/2 Housing Provision Development Control Policies DPD: GB/1 Development in the Green Belt; GB/4 Major Developed Stes in the Green Belt
Analysis	<p>One of the options put forward at Issue 9 as part of consideration of the appropriate development strategy for the new Local Plan is to focus development on the edge of Cambridge. This would involve a review of the Cambridge Green Belt. A key issue for consideration at this stage is therefore to explore the principle of whether there should be more development on the edge of Cambridge and whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify the release of further land from the Green Belt to meet the housing and employment needs of the area.</p> <p>Given the tight administrative boundary and close interrelationship with South Cambridgeshire, both councils will be working together to consider holistically how best to meet the needs of the wider Cambridge area, especially in relation to housing and employment. The current development strategy that came through the cooperative Structure Plan process in 2003, was based on the principle of providing as much housing as possible in and close to Cambridge, to create a better balance between jobs and homes, and to provide for the most sustainable development strategy consistent with protecting the most important qualities of Cambridge and the surrounding rural area and necklace villages.</p> <p>The councils will need to consider how best to achieve a Green Belt boundary that is compatible with long term sustainable development, and whether this requires the boundary to be revisited in this round of plan making. Communities in these areas will be well aware that these examinations have been undertaken previously. The process of delivering a new plan requires us to revisit these questions as part of the necessary robust examination of all reasonable options for the development strategy moving forwards. This is particularly relevant in view of the change in circumstances at Cambridge East, which will no longer come forward in the next plan period to meet longer term development needs.</p>

The NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts whose essential characteristics are their openness and permanence. Green Belt boundaries can only be established in Local Plans and “once established can only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan”. For the current Local Plan, the exceptional circumstance was provided by the policies of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the objective of delivering a sustainable development strategy focusing new homes close to jobs in Cambridge. After the withdrawal of the majority of the Structure Plan, the approach was continued in the RSS. Green Belt guidance has always made clear that Green Belt boundaries should be drawn so that they can endure beyond the end of the plan period. Current inner Green Belt boundaries have been established in a suite of recent plans – the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, two Area Action Plans from 2008 and 2009 and in the South Cambridgeshire Site Specific Policies DPD from 2010. The Inner Green Belt Study 2002 and the Cambridge Green Belt Study 2002 informed the current Green Belt boundaries.

Green Belt boundaries can only be established in Local Plans and “once established can only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan”. For the current Local Plan, the exceptional circumstance was provided by the policies of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the objective of delivering a sustainable development strategy focusing new homes close to jobs in Cambridge. After the withdrawal of the majority of the Structure Plan, the approach was continued in the RSS. Green Belt guidance has always made clear that Green Belt boundaries should be drawn so that they can endure beyond the end of the plan period.

When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. They should also ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development.

In view of the need for additional housing allocations to meet development needs over the next 20 years and the need to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, it is necessary at this stage to consider whether there is a need for a further review the Cambridge Green Belt.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

NPPF is clear that Green Belts should only be reviewed through Local Plans where there are exceptional circumstances justifying such a review. It is therefore necessary to question whether such

	circumstances exist. There are no other reasonable alternatives.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 11: Do you consider that more land, beyond that already released and committed, on the edge of Cambridge and potentially at larger villages, should be released from the Green Belt in order to achieve sustainable development?</p> <p>Please provide any comments and explain why you think there are exceptional circumstances?</p>

Issue 12	Green Belt Locations
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11 • Cambridge Green Belt Study - Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD: ST/1 Green Belt; ST/2 Housing Provision • Development Control Policies DPD: GB/1 Development in the Green Belt
Analysis	<p>In order to ensure that the testing process for the new Local Plan is robust, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council have decided to take a 2 stage approach to reviewing the land on the edge of Cambridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1: Issues & Options Consultation Summer 2012: Looks comprehensively at all possible broad locations where Green Belt boundaries could be reviewed to see if further land could be removed from the Green Belt. • Stage 2: Issues & Options Consultation Winter 2012: Depending on the outcome of the Stage 1 review which will include a comparison with the relative sustainability of development elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, consultation on specific development site options. <p>Each broad location for the Stage 1 consultation is shown in Figure 3 of the Issues and Options Consultation document. Many of the broad locations cross the boundary with Cambridge, while others are entirely within one or other district. For the purposes of completeness, all broad locations on the edge of the city are addressed in the consultation. Comments are sought on all the broad locations including those in Cambridge to assist the Councils to take a coordinated approach on this important issue.</p> <p>All of the broad locations identified for testing could theoretically be built out for housing in whole or in part, taking account of planning constraints such as flooding, environmental designations or heritage assets. The suitability of land on the edge of Cambridge for housing will however turn on the principle of whether the Green Belt should be reviewed as part of developing a new sustainable development strategy for the Cambridge area, and if so, whether individual sites within broad locations could be released. A key issue will be whether such releases and the level of harm they would have on the purposes of the Green Belt including the setting of Cambridge and separation with necklace villages are considered on balance to be</p>

	<p>acceptable within the wider strategic framework.</p> <p>Assessments of each of the broad locations have been undertaken jointly by the two Councils. The following information has been provided for each broad location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and Context; • Designations and Constraints – heritage and environmental assets, planning policy designations, flooding and drainage, topography, pollution/noise; • Planning history – Previous plans, conclusions from Inspector’s reports, key planning applications; • Green Belt and Landscape – significance to Green Belt purposes, function with regard to character and setting, including rural character of the landscape; • Schools, Utilities and Services – existing services and facilities available, new facilities required to serve the development; • Transport – highway capacity, public transport, site access; • Availability and deliverability. <p>A comprehensive approach has been taken to the Green Belt around Cambridge, jointly with Cambridge City Council, and the community’s views are sought whether they think any of the broad locations listed here and assessed in Appendix 2 of the Issues and Options Consultation document have any potential for housing development, whether that is may be for a small area of development close to the built up area, or possibly a larger site.</p> <p>The broad locations are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land to the North & South of Barton Road (includes land in both districts) 2. Playing Fields off Grantchester Road, Newnham (includes land in both districts) 3. Land West of Trumpington Road (includes land in Cambridge only) 4. Land West of Hauxton Road (includes land in both districts) 5. Land South of Addenbrooke’s Road (includes land in both districts) 6. Land South of Addenbrooke’s Road between Babraham Road & Shelford Road (includes land in both districts) 7. Land between Babraham Road & Fulbourn Road (includes land in both districts) 8. Land East of Gazelle Way (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) 9. Land at Fen Ditton (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) 10. Land between Huntingdon Road & Histon Road (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) <p>The City Council has included indicative capacities for land within its area. This is possible because of the tightly drawn administrative boundary, which means that there is a finite physical capacity in each location. The same does not apply to South Cambridgeshire and no capacities have been included in the assessments, which would require making some judgment on the extent of land that</p>
--	--

	<p>should be used to determine capacity.</p> <p>Following consultation on this Issues and Options Report, all comments received will be assessed and subsequent consultation on any reasonable site options with specific boundaries will be undertaken in Winter 2012, prior to both the District Council and Cambridge City Council developing draft local plans.</p> <p>A consultation on specific site options that may be identified will include an indication of capacity. This means that it is not possible at this stage to identify the potential capacity from land on the edge of Cambridge in South Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Councils consider that given the significance of the Green Belt, the most appropriate approach is the 2-stage process being undertaken, rather than move directly to stage 2.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 12: Do you consider that any of the following broad locations have potential to be released from the Green Belt to provide new housing to help meet the needs of the Cambridge area? (tick any number of boxes):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land to the North & South of Barton Road (includes land in both districts) 2. Playing Fields off Granchester Road, Newnham (includes land in both districts) 3. Land West of Trumpington Road (includes land in Cambridge only) 4. Land West of Hauxton Road (includes land in both districts) 5. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road (includes land in both districts) 6. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road between Babraham Road & Shelford Road (includes land in both districts) 7. Land between Babraham Road & Fulbourn Road (includes land in both districts) 8. Land East of Gazelle Way (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) 9. Land at Fen Ditton (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) 10. Land between Huntingdon Road & Histon Road (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only) <p>Please provide any comments, and indicate the area of land at the relevant broad location that you feel has potential, either in words</p>

	or provide a map.
--	-------------------

Issue 13	Rural Settlement Categories
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village Services and Facilities Study: Report 2012 • Village Classification Report June 2012
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD: ST/4 Rural Centres; ST/5 Minor Rural Centres; ST/6 Group Villages; ST/7 Infill Villages.
Analysis	<p>The current plan groups villages into 4 categories that reflect their relative sustainability in terms of location and function, size, services and facilities, and accessibility to Cambridge or a market town by sustainable modes of transport, particularly by bus or train. Having appropriate village groupings is important both to help direct new housing allocations to the most sustainable locations and also to help inform the policies for windfall development in villages to make sure that such development is appropriate in scale and reflects the relative sustainability of the village. Villages are currently categorised as Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centre, Group Villages or Infill Villages.</p> <p>The Village Classification Report (June 2012) responds to the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework that ‘planning policies and decisions should actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.’ The paper provides a review of the village hierarchy, reviewing the previously used methodology and the impact of any changes in village circumstances. The existing settlement hierarchy is then re-assessed, and options for revisions to the hierarchy identified.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The review looks at the larger villages (all those over 3000 population as before, plus those over 2000 population to test whether any others should be considered). This has broadly confirmed the split between the less sustainable majority of villages i.e. Group and Infill villages, and the more sustainable larger villages.</p> <p>However, it does suggest that there is a case to review the split between Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres in respect of two villages and it identifies that a number of additional villages of between 2000 and 3000 population should be considered as possible Minor Rural Centres, performing better than some of the current villages in that category, or that a new category of Better Served Group Villages be added, primarily because they contain a secondary school or are very close to the edge of Cambridge.</p> <p>Options exist around the way the more sustainable villages are categorised, which is demonstrated by the summary of the assessment of the larger villages contained as Appendix 3 to the Issues and Options report and contained in the Village Categorisation Report. No changes are proposed to the remaining Group and Infill villages on the basis that there are not considered to be reasonable options in view of their relative sustainability.</p>

	<p>The impact of the new Guided Busway on villages along the route was investigated as part of the assessment process. The three larger villages of Oakington, Longstanton and Over lie relatively close to the Guided Busway. They are not generally in easy walking distance for much, or all, of the village, although they would be within cycling distance. They also do not perform well in terms of the level of services and facilities. It is therefore not considered that the villages warrant a higher status despite being near to the Guided Busway.</p> <p>The issue of the approach to development at all villages is considered separately at Issues 14 and 15. A number of options for village classification have been identified for consultation under this issue, covering the range of reasonable options identified through the analysis in the Report as contained in Question 14.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 13: Which, if any, of the following changes to the rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?</p> <p>Rural Centres:</p> <p>i. Should Cottenham be added as a Rural Centre (up from a Minor Rural Centre)?</p> <p>ii. Should Fulbourn be deleted from the Rural Centre category and added as a Minor Rural Centre?</p> <p>Minor Rural Centres:</p> <p>iii. Should the following be added as Minor Rural Centres?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Milton - Swavesey - Bassingbourn - Girton - Comberton <p>Better Served Group Villages:</p> <p>iv. Should there be a further sub division of village categories to create a new category of better served group villages?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Milton - Swavesey - Bassingbourn - Girton - Comberton <p>v. If so, should the 3 Minor Rural Centres that score less than the Better Served Group villages be changed to fall within this new category? They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Papworth Everard - Willingham - Waterbeach <p>Other Group Villages and Infill Villages:</p>

	vi. Should these remain in the same categories as in the current plan?
--	--

Issue 14	Scale of Housing Development at Villages
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village Services and Facilities Study: Report 2012 • Village Classification Report June 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD: ST/4 Rural Centres; ST/5 Minor Rural Centres; ST/6 Group Villages; ST/7 Infill Villages.
Analysis	<p>The current plan sets the amount of development that can take place at the different categories of village through windfall development (sites not allocated in the plan) based on their relative sustainability. For Rural Centres, there is no limit of the size of a development, reflecting that they are the best served and most accessible villages. In Minor Rural Centres, development is limited to an indicative maximum scheme size of 30 dwellings, with developments towards upper end that place a burden on local services and facilities expected to make financial contributions towards improving them. Development in Group villages is limited to 8 dwellings, with exceptionally up to 15 dwellings being acceptable where it makes the best use of a single brownfield site. Development in Infill villages is limited to 2 dwellings, with exceptionally up to 8 being acceptable where it makes the best use of a single brownfield site.</p> <p>A question for the new plan is whether the current limits on the scale of development that can come forward on windfall sites remain appropriate or whether there should be a different approach. In view of the continuing need to provide new homes to meet the needs of the area, and the principle of supporting rural communities to remain strong and vital, it is not considered to be a reasonable option to reduce development levels below those in the current plan.</p> <p>Some local communities have indicated that they feel that the current policies restrict the potential for their communities to take any new development of even a limited nature. The Council therefore wishes to explore the approach to the scale of development at villages through this consultation.</p> <p>The question is therefore whether there should be greater flexibility provided to allow larger developments and if so whether this should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a similar approach to that currently in place, but with higher numbers, or • by removing any numbers and applying criteria that look at each development proposal on its merits and having regard to the character of the village concerned. <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>Options that could respond to the issues identified are:</p>

	<p>i. Retain the existing approach to the scale of any individual windfall scheme in villages (with the potential addition of Better Served Group Villages with, say, a limit of 20 dwellings on any individual scheme);</p> <p>ii. Retain numerical limits but increase the scale of any individual scheme allowed. For example (different levels could be chosen):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minor Rural Centres could increase from 30 to 50 dwellings - Better Served Group Villages could be set at 30 dwellings - Group Villages could increase from 8 to 20 dwellings - Infill villages could increase from 2 to 10 dwellings <p>iii. Remove numerical limits for Minor Rural Centres (and if they are added, also remove limits for Better Served Group Villages), so that along with Rural Centres, the most sustainable categories of settlement would have no limit on individual scheme sizes, having regard to village character.</p> <p>iv. Remove numerical limits on individual schemes for all categories of village and dealing with all proposals on their merits having regard to village character.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 14: What approach do you think the Local Plan should take for individual housing schemes within village frameworks on land not specially identified for housing:</p> <p>i. Retain existing numerical limits for individual schemes</p> <p>ii. Increase the size allowed for individual schemes.</p> <p>iii. Remove scheme size limits for Minor Rural Centres, and if included for Better Served Group Villages, so they are the same as Rural Centres</p> <p>iv. Remove scheme size limits for all categories of village</p>

Issue 15	Approach to Village Frameworks
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village Services and Facilities Study: Report 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: DP/7 Development Frameworks; HG/5 Exceptions Sites for Affordable Housing.
Analysis and initial Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Plans for South Cambridgeshire have included village frameworks for many years. They have the advantage of restricting the gradual expansion of villages into the open countryside in an uncontrolled and unplanned way. They also provide certainty to both local communities and the development industry of the Council's approach to development at villages.</p>

Many of the villages in South Cambridgeshire offer attractive local living environments based around close knit communities but often have limited services and facilities and poor access to public transport. In terms of policies designed to reduce travel and achieve good levels of access to a range of employment and service opportunities many villages do not score well as locations for development. However, some local communities have indicated that they feel that the current policies restrict the potential for their communities to take any new development of even a limited nature. The Council therefore wishes to explore the approach to village frameworks through this consultation.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

Alternatives could be considered to the current village framework approach. Village Frameworks have been in place for a long time and the policy for windfall development on land not allocated in plans means that many possible opportunities have already been developed. The windfall policy is intended to allow small scale development to occur in even the smallest villages. Whilst the evidence is that windfalls continue to come forward because circumstances change over time, the new Plan could take a different approach if it was decided that it should be more flexible and allow some additional development at villages beyond the current village framework boundaries.

There are different ways this could be done. This is potentially a radical change in approach from previous plans. In view of the new Localism agenda, the Council wishes to seek the views of Parish Councils and local residents on whether a greater degree of flexibility is appropriate, or whether the current approach remains the best approach.

The new Local Plan could:

- i. Retain village frameworks and the current approach to resisting development outside frameworks as defined on the Proposals Map.
- ii. Retain village frameworks but include a policy that would allow limited additional development outside and adjoining the frameworks where certain criteria were met.
- iii. Delete the current village frameworks entirely and instead use a policy that makes clear in words the Council's approach to development on the edge of the built up area of a village.

Options (ii) and (iii) would be perceived as a loosening of the Council's approach to development in the countryside on the edge of villages and there is a risk that it could weaken the ability of the Council to resist inappropriate development on the edge of villages. Indeed there seems little point in changing the approach, unless there is a desire to provide more flexibility for more development to

	<p>come forward on the edge of villages and potentially delivering development that is less sustainable than the current strategy.</p> <p>The question would be how much development was being sought, what form it would take, and how overall levels of development could be controlled to avoid sites coming forward all around villages that might be difficult to resist. There is also a significant risk that exception sites for affordable housing may stop coming forward as landowners see a possibility of gaining greater value out of their land.</p> <p>See also the exception sites at Issue 47 which may be an alternative approach better targeted to meeting local housing needs as it includes options to allow a limited amount of additional market housing at different levels as part of exception affordable housing sites, and Issue 7 on Localism.</p> <p>If village frameworks are retained in the new Plan, they will be carried forward from the adopted plan, unless any anomalies are identified to the Council that need to be corrected.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 15:</p> <p>A: Do you think the new Local Plan should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. retain village frameworks and the current approach to restricting development outside framework boundaries as defined on the Proposals Map ii. retain village frameworks as defined on the Proposals Map but include policies that allow small scale development adjacent to village frameworks where certain criteria are met, addressing issues including landscape, townscape, and access. iii. delete the current village frameworks entirely and provide greater flexibility for some development on the edge of villages controlled through a written policy. <p>B. Are you aware of any existing village framework boundaries that are not drawn appropriately because they do not follow property boundaries?</p>

5. Development Options

Issue 16	Development Options
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2012 (SHLAA) • The sustainability appraisal of the SHLAA sites (annex 1) • Settlement summaries of site suitability drawn from the SHLAA and SA assessments (annex 2) • Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 • The LDF Adopted Proposals map July 2011
Existing policies	N/A
Analysis	<p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. It states that the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through larger scale development such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns. It states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p> <p>In order to identify reasonable site options, the Council has drawn on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) of the sites proposed to us for development through the “Call for Sites” process in 2011, together with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of each site, and a summary assessment that draws together the two assessments and reaches a view on the ‘Sustainable Development Potential’ of each site. Appendix 6 of the SHLAA document includes detailed assessments of all sites and can be viewed on our website: www.scambs.gov.uk/ldf/shlaa . Annexes 1 of this Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report includes detailed sustainability appraisals of all sites, and the summary assessment for each site.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Sustainability Assessments identify key constraints and considerations relating to potential development sites including suitability, availability and achievability. In order to draw information together in an accessible form, and reach an overall conclusion on the merits of the sites assessed, key elements from both assessments have been combined in a series of settlement summaries which enable the most and least sustainable sites in each settlement to be identified. This has been collated in Annex 2 to this report.</p> <p>These assessments explore issues in two groups, providing an assessment of the impact and its significance, using a similar mechanism to the SA of identifying a range from significant positive to significant negative impacts. The first group of issues comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic considerations identified in the SHLAA – Identifies if a site is subject to any strategic considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development e.g. flood risk, impact on SSSI or Listed Buildings (reflects tier 1 of the SHLAA site Assessment. Green Belt impact was drawn out separately). • Green Belt – Sites in the Green Belt are identified by a negative score, sites outside as neutral. If it is in the Green Belt, impact on the function of the Green Belt was considered, and the scale of impact

	<p>identified. This assessment included in the SHLAA utilises the LDA Green Belt Study 2002 to guide consideration. Green Belt as a matter of principle was NOT used as an exclusionary factor at this stage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHLAA significant local considerations – Identifies if a site is subject to heritage, environmental and physical considerations, from tier 2 of the SHLAA Assessment (note landscape and townscape impact drawn out separately) • Landscape and townscape impact – reflects the conclusions of the SHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal. • SHLAA site specific factors – Considers the availability and achievability of the site. If a site is scored as a significant negative, it is rejected, as it cannot be delivered.(Reflects tier 3 of the SHLAA assessment). • Access to key local services, distance to key local services, Accessibility by sustainable transport modes – draws on the Sustainability Appraisal to consider transport accessibility. <p>Each summary concludes with the ‘Sustainable Development Potential’. This draws on the SHLAA Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal. It categorises sites as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More Sustainable Sites with Development Potential (few constraints or adverse impacts) GREEN ○ Less sustainable but with development potential (some constraints or adverse impacts) AMBER ○ Least Sustainable, with no significant development potential (significant constraints or adverse impacts) RED <p>The entries in the summary assessment sometimes represent a judgement about a number of separate criteria from the SHLAA and Sustainability Appraisal assessments and represent a balanced view of the overall performance of that site across a range of criteria. The settlement summaries taken together with the full assessments allow for sites to be selected to meet a number of different options relating to the scale of growth and spatial development strategies.</p> <p>Sites identified as ‘Least Sustainable, with no significant development potential’ have been rejected at this stage, because they are not considered reasonable options for development. Some sites at smaller villages have been identified as Amber, but have not been put forward for consultation given the number of dwellings available at a range of sites in more sustainable locations.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives</p> <p>The identified site options can be combined in numerous ways to provide for assessed need. They enable the consequences for sustainable</p>
--	--

	<p>development to be understood. To satisfy the NPPF they should look at the scope for development within and outside the Green Belt and consider the merits of new settlements and larger scale extensions to villages and towns. Assessment of Green Belt sites on the edge of Cambridge will only take place if the Issues and Options consultation identifies one or more broad locations for possible Green Belt release. The public can propose the deletion and addition of sites.</p> <p>52 site options have been identified for consultation, and are listed in the Issues and Options Report. The site options cover a range of scales and locations of development from new settlement options to village development of varying sizes, to provide a genuine choice in moving to a preferred set of sites in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The site options provide for up to 23,000 homes (taking the larger number where there are alternatives). However, this includes the whole of new settlements, and as said above, it is not realistic to expect such sites to provide housing until the latter part of the plan period, and their contribution towards the housing figure for 2031 will be reduced accordingly.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 16:</p> <p>A: Which of the site options do you support or object to and why?</p> <p>B: Are there any other sites that we should consider? (these could be sites already submitted through the “Call for Sites” process or new sites).</p>

6. Climate Change

Issue 17	Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change
Key evidence	South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide SPD (2010)
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Policy DP/1 Sustainable Development
Analysis	<p>Our day to day activities and current lifestyles are releasing significant quantities of a range of greenhouse gases (predominantly carbon dioxide) into the atmosphere. This is causing our climate to change in ways that are threatening how we live both today and tomorrow. The effects of climate change include shifts in our seasons, heat-waves, drought, and other extreme weather events such as flash flooding and strong winds. Both reducing and being less vulnerable to these changes in our climate is an essential part of the environmental element of sustainable development. The Planning Act 2008 requires local planning authorities to include policies in their Local Plans designed to secure development and use of land that will contribute to the 'mitigation' of, and 'adaptation' to, climate change. This should be considered during the design, construction and occupation of any new development.</p> <p>Climate change mitigation describes the measures that can be taken to reduce our contribution to climate change, this includes locating, designing and constructing developments in ways that reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Climate change adaptation describes the measures that can be included within developments that will take account of the effects of climate change, this includes managing flood risk and using water efficiently.</p> <p>The UK is committed under the Climate Change Act 2008 to an 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions² by 2050 (from 1990 levels) and a 26% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by 2020 (from 1990 levels). In 2009, South Cambridgeshire greenhouse gas emissions stood at 8.5 tonnes per person (the Cambridgeshire average is 7.6 tonnes per person). In order to contribute to an overall reduction, new development should ensure that resultant per person figures are markedly below the most recent dataset³.</p> <p>The existing Local Development Framework policy for sustainable development already seeks to ensure that new development is sustainable, mitigates further impacts on climate change, and minimises the vulnerability to the effects of climate change through adaptation. However, given the increased emphasis on climate change adaptation and mitigation set out in the Planning Act 2008, it</p>

² Greenhouse gas emissions are the collective name for a range of gases that trap some of the sun's warmth within the earth's atmosphere. The most prevalent greenhouse gas at around 85% is carbon dioxide, others include methane (typically from agriculture and landfill), nitrous oxide (typically from agriculture), and fluorocarbons (often used as refrigerants).

³ http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/climate_stats/climate_stats.aspx

	<p>is important that this is reflected in the Council's planning policies.</p> <p>The Local Plan could therefore ensure that development will only be permitted where the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation have been embedded within the proposal.</p> <p>To mitigate climate change, proposals could demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • energy efficiency; • use and generation of renewable and low carbon energy; • promotion of sustainable forms of transport such as using buses, cycling or walking, and reduction of car use; • recycling and waste reduction both during construction and occupation; and • inclusion of communications infrastructure (e.g. broadband) to facilitate home working. <p>To adapt to the effects of climate change, proposals could demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • water use management and conservation (e.g. rainwater recycling and greywater harvesting); • management of flood risk to acceptable levels; • open space and use of vegetation for shading, natural cooling, and to reduce flooding / surface water run-off; • use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDs); and • careful layout and orientation and the incorporation of design and material measures to minimise overheating. <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>The Council considers that there are no reasonable alternatives other than to include a policy requiring the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation to be embedded within all new development.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 17:</p> <p>Have the right issues for addressing climate change mitigation and adaptation been identified?</p>

Issue 18	Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East of England Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Capacity Study (2011) • Cambridgeshire Renewables Infrastructure Framework (CRIF) (2012)
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: Policy NE/2 Renewable Energy

Analysis	<p>Fuel poverty is affecting 13.5% of households in the district⁴. The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable and low carbon sources and the UK Government has committed to sourcing 15% of its energy from renewable sources by 2020.</p> <p>This is a very necessary but challenging target and a range of policies have been brought forward or implemented to facilitate delivery including the Feed-in Tariff, Renewables Obligation, Renewable Heat Incentive, zero carbon buildings policy and forthcoming Green Deal.</p> <p>The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) (DECC, 2011) states that “the UK economy is reliant on fossil fuels, and they are likely to play a significant role for some time to come. ... However, the UK needs to wean itself off such a high carbon energy mix: to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and to improve the security, availability and affordability of energy through diversification.”</p> <p>Renewable and low carbon energy uses natural sources such as the sun, wind, earth and sea to produce energy, and includes technologies such as photovoltaic panels, wind turbines, solar thermal panels, air or ground source heat pumps, anaerobic digestion plants, and biomass boilers.</p> <p>In South Cambridgeshire (as in the rest of the country) our principal source of energy to heat and power our buildings and businesses is fossil fuels. The vast majority is delivered to us through national grid systems that connect very large centralised plants and their suppliers – electricity from power stations using the national electricity cable grid, and heat from burning gas using the national gas pipeline grid. Other heating fuels (typically oil) also play a big part and are delivered to individual properties via the national road ‘grid’. Another area of infrastructure with less direct, but very significant implications, is the national network of petrol stations fuelling how we get around.</p> <p>Switching to more renewable energy supplies and providing the delivery infrastructure that comes with them, is probably the greatest engineering, plant replacement and related social adjustment challenge of modern times. Fuel supplies for generating renewable energy are very different and require a very different infrastructure. Typically, renewable energy sources such as the sun, wind, earth and sea need to be converted to useable energy and the plant is far</p>
----------	---

⁴ Data is taken from the Department for Energy and Climate Change and based on data estimating levels of fuel poverty in 2008:
<http://atlas.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/Housing/FuelPoverty/atlas.html>

more extensive for every kilowatt of energy generated. This produces an infrastructure with a large proportion of often highly visible and dispersed or decentralised low output generators. These energy sources do not have the concentrated 'portability' of oil, coal or gas that allow for a relatively small number of huge centralised power stations that lie at the heart of fossil fuel derived energy infrastructure. Biomass and biogas are the exceptions but lengthy conventional road transportation can remove the benefits. Extending nuclear energy generation and the use of technologies to 'clean-up' fossil fuel fired power stations (such as carbon capture and storage) may have a significant role to play but delivery is probably at least 10-15 years away and we do not have that much time to spare.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should deliver renewable and low carbon energy in their area by:

- designing planning policies to maximise provision while ensuring adverse impacts (including cumulative landscape and visual impacts) are satisfactorily addressed;
- considering identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy developments;
- supporting community led initiatives for the generation of renewable and low carbon energy; and
- identifying opportunities where new developments can use decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems, and where there are opportunities for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers.

The Council's Climate Change Action Plan 2011-2013 identifies supporting community led renewable and low carbon energy initiatives as a key objective for the district. Planning permission for the first community wind turbine in the district, located on edge of Gamlingay, was granted in April 2012. Through the South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Parish Energy Partnership, the Council is encouraging further community renewable energy projects.

Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments

South Cambridgeshire is currently producing a relatively low level of energy from local renewable and low carbon energy sources, compared to neighbouring districts. To help support the achievement of the national target and comply with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework, the district will need to generate higher levels of renewable and low carbon energy from technologies.

The Cambridgeshire Renewables Infrastructure Framework (CRIF, 2012) project sought to identify Cambridgeshire's capacity to deliver renewably sourced energy and the pathways down which this might be achieved. This took the Government's adopted national target of

	<p>a 50% reduction in carbon emissions by 2025 (from a 1990 baseline) and transposed it on to Cambridgeshire where it implied a 43% CO_{2e} reduction between 2010 and 2025 through a combination of energy efficiency improvements, national electricity grid decarbonisation, local renewable energy deployment and transport measures. The Committee on Climate Change’s advice to Government proposes an 18% renewable electricity target and 35% renewable heat target for 2030. Taken together this equates to a 28% overall renewable energy target for Cambridgeshire (excluding transport) by 2030.</p> <p>The CRIF report estimates the theoretical capacity for renewable energy generation if all technically suitable locations were developed and identifies three scenarios which are considered alongside the overall target for Cambridgeshire by 2030. South Cambridgeshire is identified as having the second greatest potential for renewable energy generation in the county, behind Huntingdonshire. The study shows the district has a theoretical potential of providing over 5,000 GWh of renewable energy, however the calculations do not take any account of specific constraints and issues such as impact on landscape, townscape and heritage assets and are very much a maximum capacity across every part of the district.</p> <p>The visual impacts of renewable and low carbon energy generators vary with the scale of the landscape in which they are located. The South Cambridgeshire landscape is relatively fine-grained and includes villages that are particularly distinctive. The settlements occupy a variety of positions – hilltops, valley-sides and along spring lines. Within a predominantly medium to large-scale arable farmland landscape, the incremental historical evolution of our settlements means that their structure often exhibits a complex mix of patterns, including linear, dispersed, nucleated, agglomerated and planned. It is a relatively sparsely occupied but very human-scaled landscape of smaller local settlements. Given the nature of the landscape and townscape of South Cambridgeshire it is not appropriate to identify suitable broad locations for renewable and low carbon energy developments and supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>In February 2011, the Council resolved that “this Council supports seeking energy from renewable resources. However, applications for wind farms (2 turbines or more) cause deep concerns to our residents by nature of their size, scale and noise. This Council believes that a minimum distance of 2 km between a dwelling and a turbine should be set to protect residents from disturbance and visual impact. If the applicant can prove that this is not the case a shorter distance would be considered. This will be addressed during the review of the Local Development Framework.”</p> <p>The Government received comments on its draft National Policy Statements for Energy Infrastructure that argued that a French study</p>
--	---

	<p>and Scottish regulations banned wind farms within 2 km of human habitation. In responding to these comments, the Government stated that these allegations are unfounded and therefore there is no rationale for imposing a ban as suggested⁵. The Government also concluded that such a ban would, for most purposes, be impractical in England as suitable sites are likely to be within 2 km of some form of human habitation.</p> <p>The Government also responded to comments that the standard noise measurement methodology set out in 'The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms' (ETSU-R-97) was out of date by stating that there is currently no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the fundamental guidelines are unsound, and that they have commissioned a research project to investigate noise impacts from wind farms and establish best practice in assessing and rating wind turbine noise.</p> <p>Torridge District Council (May 2010) and Cherwell District Council (February 2011) have both adopted separation distances between wind turbines and residential properties, however the policy is not included within the development plan and therefore has not been tested by an independent planning inspector. Torridge District Council requires a separation distance of 600 m between a wind turbine and any residential property, either isolated or part of a settlement. Cherwell District Council requires an indicative minimum separation distance of 800 m between a wind turbine and a residential property. One major planning application for two wind turbines (maximum height 100 m) has been considered by Torridge District Council (1/0311/2011/FULM). The nearest settlements were approximately 2 km and 4 km from the proposed wind turbines. The planning application was refused based on: the proposal creating an adverse visual impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape including an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; insufficient information submitted to demonstrate that noise generation will be within the limits set by ETSU-R-97 and that there will be no adverse visual impact on the historic environment; absence of appropriate wildlife surveys; and unacceptable interference with military radars. An appeal is being considered. No planning applications for wind turbines have been determined by Cherwell District Council since the adoption of the policy, although some planning applications are pending determination.</p> <p>Milton Keynes Local Plan (Policy D5) requires that wind turbines should be sited at least 350 m from any dwellings. A recent public consultation proposed revising the separation distance to be based on the height of the turbine, with 350 m being retained as the</p>
--	---

5

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110302182042/https://www.energynpsconsultation.decc.gov.uk/docs/GovernmentResponsetoConsultation-October2010.pdf>

	<p>separation distance for turbines of up to 25 m. For turbines of 100 m in height, a separation distance of 1 km has been proposed, and for heights between 25 m and 100 m, a prorated separation distance has been proposed. Milton Keynes Council is currently considering the representations received.</p> <p>Although we have not been able to identify any specific evidence to support 2 km as a minimum separation distance, an option including a separation distance of 2km should be included for consultation to reflect the Council's resolution.</p> <p>In considering proposals for renewable and low carbon energy developments including wind farms, the impact on residential amenity is only one of many material considerations.</p> <p>Supporting effective engagement should ensure that decisions made are as well-informed, evidence-based and timely as possible, and that developments permitted reflect an understanding of local interests and opportunities for positive local gain. The Protocol for Public Engagement with Proposed Wind Energy Developments in England (2007) states that a high quality approach to public engagement can be achieved through five key principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. access to information; 2. the opportunity to contribute ideas; 3. the opportunity to take an active part in developing proposals and options; 4. the opportunity to be consulted and make representations on formal proposals; and 5. the opportunity to receive feedback and be informed about progress and outcomes. <p>To ensure that the Local Plan maximises the generation of renewable and low carbon energy within the district, a criteria based policy could be developed identifying the issues that should be addressed when considering a proposed renewable or low carbon energy development.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to develop a criteria based policy seeking to maximise the generation of renewable and low carbon energy and identifying issues that would need to be addressed; or • to develop a criteria based policy seeking to maximise the generation of renewable and low carbon energy and identifying issues that would need to be addressed, but specifically requiring a separation distance of 2 km between a proposed wind farm (2 or more turbines) and any residential property to protect residents from disturbance and visual impact. <p>Use of Decentralised Renewable or Low Carbon Energy Supply</p>
--	--

	<p>Systems</p> <p>Higher density housing schemes (40-120 dwellings per hectare) or groups of commercial buildings are the most appropriate and viable locations for decentralised renewable or low carbon energy supply systems such as district heating systems. The new Local Plan could identify future growth areas or new settlements as potentially suitable locations for the inclusion of renewable or low carbon district heating systems, such as biomass combined heat and power plants.</p> <p>Experience from considering the North West Cambridge and Northstowe developments supports this assertion. For North West Cambridge, studies have indicated that a gas-fired combined heat and power system in combination with micro-generation low carbon or renewable energy technologies for the lower density areas should return a 70% reduction on ‘regulated’ emissions. For Northstowe, a similar arrangement but using a biomass-fired combined heat and power system could deliver full carbon neutrality.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • do not include a policy; or • identify future growth areas or new settlements as potentially suitable locations for the inclusion of renewable or low carbon district heating systems.
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 18:</p> <p>A: What approach do you think the Local Plan should take for the generation of renewable and low carbon energy?</p> <p>i. Include a criteria based policy seeking to maximise the generation of renewable and low carbon energy in the district and identifying the issues that would need to be addressed, and this would leave developers to make applications for their preferred areas.</p> <p>ii. Include a criteria based policy as set out in option i, but specifically requiring a separation distance of 2 km between a proposed wind farm (2 or more wind turbines) and any residential property, to protect residents from disturbance and visual impact. If the applicant can prove this is not the case a shorter distance will be considered.</p> <p>B: Should the Local Plan identify future growth areas and new settlements as potentially suitable locations for the inclusion of renewable or low carbon district heating systems?</p> <p>C: What type of renewable and low carbon energy sources should the Local Plan consider and at what scale?</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p>

Issue 19	Renewables in New Developments
Key evidence	Review of Merton Rule-style Policies in four Local Planning Authorities in Cambridgeshire (anticipated 2012)
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Policy NE/3 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development
Analysis	<p>New developments, such as housing, employment and community uses, can generate their own renewable energy by incorporating micro-generation of renewable and low carbon energy into their design. This will also contribute to the achievement of national renewable energy targets.</p> <p>The Council's existing planning policy requires all development proposals of greater than 1,000 sqm or 10 dwellings to include renewable energy technologies that will provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements. Alongside supporting national targets for renewable energy generation, this 'Merton style' policy also plays an important role in delivering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. onsite carbon reduction levels beyond those achieved through building fabric and construction measures; ii. renewable energy as an increasingly standard response to concerns over rising 'grid-supplied' energy prices and security of supply; and iii. a strengthened supply chain (ideally locally) for the installation, service and maintenance of renewable energy technologies (providing a local economic benefit). <p>The District Design Guide SPD provides guidance on the methodology that should be used to calculate the carbon emissions generated by the building and the required amount of renewable energy required to meet the 10% requirement. It is important that the new Local Plan clearly sets out the methodology used to calculate the target to ensure that it is measured in terms of CO₂ emissions and also to ensure that it incorporates both 'regulated' and 'unregulated' carbon emissions.</p> <p>The progressive implementation of the Government's zero carbon building policy also has implications for the relevance of 'Merton style' policies. It is likely that at least until the policy is fully implemented for homes and public buildings from 2016 and for all other buildings from 2019, that it may well be possible to meet the Building Regulations standards for carbon reduction without the need to include technologies that generate low carbon or renewable energy. It is also recognised that a renewable energy policy will most likely be made redundant as the zero carbon requirement is implemented as applicants will almost certainly need to include onsite renewable energy technologies to meet the carbon compliance levels that will come with these new regulations, and</p>

	<p>there maybe value in going beyond this level to negate the need for what may, in certain situations, be more expensive ‘allowable solutions’ options. The tightening of the Building Regulations will already put some additional pressure, at least initially, on build costs.</p> <p>Heating demands are likely to reduce in future through continued improvements to the energy efficiency and air tightness of buildings, however electricity demands are likely to increase as we become more reliant on electrical devices and there will still be a demand for hot water. It must also be remembered that the nature of occupation has significant implications on the balance between the need for hot water and electricity – especially between non-domestic and domestic purposes – and it is therefore important that any onsite renewable energy policy is going to work well for the building occupier whilst both readily contributing to carbon reduction and being technically and economically viable.</p> <p>An emerging evidence base study (due to be published in July 2012) on the effectiveness of the Council’s existing planning policy for onsite renewable and low carbon energy generation has recognised the value and effectiveness of the existing policy but has also highlighted assessment, enforcement and monitoring concerns and inconsistency in delivery of the policy (in terms of securing the greatest benefit for building occupiers and owners). As a possible alternative to the existing policy, the study has suggested that all new dwellings and all buildings of 1,000 sqm or more should be required to install either solar thermal panels (which provide hot water) or photovoltaic panels (which generate electricity).</p> <p>Prioritisation of ‘solar’ technologies has been suggested as these are tried, tested and low maintenance technologies that if correctly installed continue operating without user intervention. Given the nature of ‘solar’ technologies, it is not reasonable to require more than 10% of a building’s predicted energy requirements to be provided from renewable energy technologies. To achieve more than 10% of a buildings predicted energy requirements from renewable energy would require a combination of ‘solar’ and non-‘solar’ sources.</p> <p>This does not exclude the use of other technologies such as biomass boilers, heat pumps, wind turbines and micro-combined heat and power units but helps to simplify the delivery of the policy, as in the great majority of cases, ‘solar’ technologies will provide simple, straightforward and good-value onsite renewable energy options. The balance between the need for, and delivery of, hot water and electricity will vary depending on the occupiers of the building and most significantly between domestic (which favours the renewable generation of hot water) and non-domestic (which favours the generation of renewable electricity). This bias also aligns well with</p>
--	--

	<p>typical roof-space availability as solar hot water panels take up less roof space than solar photovoltaic panels for electricity to deliver comparable relative returns.</p> <p>Other benefits of a 'solar' first approach are that by simplifying the policy requirements to two very specific and dependable technologies applicants will not necessarily need to incur the expense of onsite renewable energy assessments, and the policy would also allow applicants to consider the inclusion of renewable energy technologies early in the design process therefore ensure orientation and layout of roof-space provision is suitable.</p> <p>The study also suggests that for landlord estates, such as universities or research institutes, the installation of a site wide renewable energy solution would deliver higher carbon savings for a lower cost. This could involve a full range of renewable energy technologies including an onsite biomass combined heat and power district heating system.</p> <p>Discussions at the Local Plan workshops in March and April 2012 and at the Council's Climate Change Working Group in May 2012 suggested that the percentage requirement for the generation of renewable energy should be reviewed to ensure that it is appropriate and sufficient.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • do not include a policy; • revised policy requiring all new developments to provide onsite renewable energy and specifying the percentage of a building's predicted energy requirements to be provided from renewable energy sources; or • revised policy setting a site size threshold for the provision of onsite renewable energy and specifying the percentage of a building's predicted energy requirements to be provided from renewable energy sources.
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 19: To what extent should new development provide for onsite renewable energy generation?</p> <p>i. All new developments should be required to provide onsite renewable energy? If so, should 10%, 15% or 20% equivalent provision be required?</p> <p>ii. Small scale developments of less than 5 dwellings or less than 500 m² of non-residential floor space should be exempt?</p> <p>iii. No requirements for renewable energy generation should be made.</p>

	Please provide any comments.
--	------------------------------

Issue 20	Community Energy Fund
Key evidence	Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund (Element Energy, 2012)
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>It is likely that the Government's zero carbon policy, which is due to be introduced for new homes from 2016 and for non-residential buildings from 2019, will require new developments to achieve zero carbon from 'regulated' emissions (essentially those arising from heating, lighting and ventilation) using a combination of onsite energy efficiency solutions, onsite renewable and low carbon energy generation and offsite 'allowable solutions'. 'Allowable solutions' are offsite measures that developers can take to mitigate the residual carbon emissions. The Government has suggested the establishment of an 'energy fund' as one 'allowable solution'. This fund would use developer contributions to invest in energy efficiency and renewable and low carbon energy projects.</p> <p>An energy fund is not an additional cost on developers over the cost of achieving the zero carbon policy. If developers choose not to make a payment into an energy fund, they will be required to make investments into other eligible measures that deliver the same carbon reduction. While the zero carbon policy is likely to increase the cost of development, the energy fund has the benefit for developers in that it should provide certainty in what the cost of delivering 'allowable solutions' will be.</p> <p>Although Government has yet to make it clear exactly how an 'allowable solutions' mechanism would work in relation to the establishment and operation of an energy fund, the Local Plan is an opportunity for the Council to consider the establishment of a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund that will retain the investment within the local area.</p> <p>An evidence base study has been undertaken to investigate the potential of developing a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund. The study has focussed on identifying suitable collection mechanisms, governance arrangements and structures, investments to deliver carbon reduction (e.g. retrofitting photovoltaic panels on public buildings) and methodologies for measuring and verifying the carbon reduction achieved. The study concludes that further work is needed to develop a suitable collection mechanism for payments to the Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund; however the basis for any mechanism must be established in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The study highlights that if the local planning authority does not establish such a mechanism to identify projects in the local area, then the money raised from local developments could be used to</p>

	<p>invest in projects anywhere in the country via a national database of 'allowable solutions' projects.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enable the setting up of a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund in the Local Plan; or • do not include a policy and rely on the national 'allowable solutions' framework.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 20:</p> <p>A: Should the Local Plan enable the setting up of a Community Energy Fund that would allow developers to invest in offsite energy efficiency and renewable and low carbon energy projects to meet their carbon reduction targets?</p> <p>i: Yes? ii: No?</p> <p>B: Are there other alternatives?</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p>

Issue 21	Sustainable Design and Construction
Key evidence	
Existing policies	n/a
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that planning should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, and to achieve this should seek ways to radically reduce greenhouse gas emissions, actively support energy efficiency improvements and use nationally described standards when setting any local requirements for a building's sustainability.</p> <p>To secure the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions required and to support the mitigation and adaptation to climate change, the Council could consider requiring buildings to be of a higher standard of design and construction than the national Building Regulations. The design of new buildings, including their orientation internal layout, and shading from adjacent buildings and vegetation, has a significant influence on the energy efficiency of the building. The fabric of a building also influences energy as high performance materials and construction methods can minimise energy, heat and carbon loss.</p> <p>The Code for Sustainable Homes and the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) standard for non-residential buildings are nationally recognised standards for measuring the sustainability of buildings. Both standards require highly energy efficient buildings, but also assess wider sustainability considerations such as water use, waste and recycling, pollution, health and wellbeing, and construction materials.</p>

	<p>The additional considerations are not covered by Building Regulations but are integral to a holistic approach to sustainable development.</p> <p>The Code for Sustainable Homes allows any new dwelling to be scored against nine categories to calculate its overall sustainability performance, from Level 1 to 6. Level 6 is the highest rating and dwellings meeting this standard are seen to be exemplar dwellings as the building must be zero carbon. The BREEAM standard allows any new or refurbished non-residential building, including schools, offices, and hospitals, to be scored against ten categories to calculate its overall sustainability performance, from 'pass' to 'outstanding'.</p> <p>From April 2008, all new social houses are already required to achieve the complete Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3, and from 2010, all new dwellings were required to meet the equivalent of the Level 3 energy use requirement under Building Regulations.</p> <p>The Government has suggested that the Code for Sustainable Homes is due for revision to bring it up to date with the current policy background, including the zero carbon homes policy.</p> <p>Existing Local Development Framework policies have set specific requirements for the Code for Sustainable Homes in some locations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for any dwellings approved on or before 31 March 2013 (up to a maximum of 50 dwellings) and Level 5 for any dwellings approved on or after 1 April 2013 within the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan area; and • Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 (or Level 5 in specific circumstances) for all new dwellings within the Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate, involving the reuse or redevelopment of former agricultural buildings. <p>There are cost implications of achieving the higher levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM non-residential standard. These additional costs on the development could have implications for viability and also on the provision of infrastructure such as affordable housing, educational facilities, community facilities, and public open space, or a financial contribution towards off-site provision of such infrastructure.</p> <p>The Government's cost review of achieving the different levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes estimates the additional costs per dwelling for various house types (from a 2 bed flat to a 4 bed detached house) in various locations (from a small brownfield site of 10 dwellings to a strategic greenfield site of 2,000 dwellings). The costs for a 3 bed semi detached house are⁶:</p>
--	--

⁶ <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/1972728.pdf>

		Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
Date of change to energy efficiency requirements of building regulations		Now	2013	2016	
Small Brownfield (20 dwellings at 40 dph)	Energy	£120	£3,393	£12,673	£27,393
	TOTAL *	£1,160	£4,583	£19,998	£34,718
Edge of Town (100 dwellings at 40 dph)	Energy	£120	£3,393	£13,523	£28,388
	TOTAL *	£1,588	£5,361	£21,326	£36,191
Strategic Greenfield (2,000 dwellings at 40 dph)	Energy	£120	£3,393	£13,523	£28,388
	TOTAL *	£1,571	£5,344	£21,309	£36,174
<p>* These figures include the costs set out in Issue 24 necessary to achieve the water efficiency requirements.</p> <p>It should be noted that energy efficiency standards in Building Regulations are planned to increase over the next few years, bringing them in line with higher levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Although the Council is seeking Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 for new dwellings within the Fen Drayton former Land Settlement Association estate, a requirement to achieve Level 6 in other locations within the district is not currently deemed a viable option.</p> <p>The Local Plan could require minimum levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes and the BREEAM non-residential standard to be achieved by all new developments.</p> <p>Higher standards could be set for specific types or sizes of development and flexibility could be written into the policy to enable the standards chosen to be increased over time.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> do not include a policy and rely on national Building Regulations standards for energy efficiency; require all new buildings to achieve sustainable building standards, such as Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 and BREEAM non-residential 'very good'; or require new larger scale major developments (200 dwellings or more) to achieve zero carbon standards (Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5). 					
Final Issues	Question 21:				

and Options Approaches	<p>What sustainable building standards should be required in new developments?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="507 309 1310 383">i. Developments would only have to comply with Building Regulations requirements for energy efficiency. <li data-bbox="507 421 1426 568">ii. All new buildings would comply with sustainable building standards. If so, should all new dwellings meet at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4, and all non-residential schemes meet at least the BREEAM ‘very good’ standard? <li data-bbox="507 607 1406 672">iii. The zero carbon standard (Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5) would be required in larger scale developments?
------------------------	---

Issue 22	Sustainable Show-Homes
Key evidence	
Existing policies	n/a
Analysis	<p>To encourage buyers to opt to purchase more sustainable dwellings on our new developments, it is important that they are made aware of how the sustainability of the building can be improved through the use of environmentally friendly alternatives to standard conventional options, and what the benefits will be for them when they are living in there. Many buyers like to see what something will look like before they make a decision, and therefore on developments that include show-homes it is possible to showcase these alternatives.</p> <p>The Council has secured the provision of sustainable show-homes as part of the s106 agreements for Trumpington Meadows and the Cambourne 950 development. The sustainable show-homes will demonstrate environmentally sustainable alternatives for finishes, materials, fixtures and technologies as options that can be purchased when a dwelling is bought off-plan.</p> <p>Examples of options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="518 1503 1401 1576">• sustainably sourced and low embodied energy flooring and wall finishes, kitchens and furniture; <li data-bbox="518 1576 1358 1650">• windows and doors from sustainably sourced materials, with significantly improved ‘u’ values; <li data-bbox="518 1650 1394 1688">• water efficient toilets and other sanitary ware fixtures or fittings; <li data-bbox="518 1688 1369 1762">• white goods with high energy efficiency ratings and low water consumption; <li data-bbox="518 1762 1150 1800">• low energy internal and external light fittings; <li data-bbox="518 1800 1426 1874">• renewable technologies such as solar panels (where not installed as standard); <li data-bbox="518 1874 1331 1912">• rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling devices; and <li data-bbox="518 1912 1209 1951">• smart metering (where not installed as standard). <p>A requirement is that the sustainability options are fully functional in</p>

	<p>the show-homes and that they are positively marketed. Purchasers should be clear on where alternatives are available, why it is more sustainable, and the cost of including the alternative. It must be as practical as possible for the purchaser to buy the sustainable alternatives as to purchase the standard options and unreasonable premiums should not be added for the environmentally friendly options.</p> <p>Show homes are provided on a range of sizes of developments, including on developments as small as five dwellings. For local housebuilders providing small developments it would not be viable for them to provide a sustainable show-home or provide bespoke homes including a mixture of options.</p> <p>The Local Plan could require all developments that provide a show-home to include a sustainable show-home that will demonstrate environmentally sustainable alternative finishes, materials, fixtures and technologies that could be purchased when a dwelling is bought off-plan. Alternatively, the Local Plan could set a site size threshold at which a sustainable show-home would be required.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rely on negotiating their provision on an individual site basis; • require all developments that include a show-home to provide a sustainable show-home; or • require developments of over 15 dwellings to provide a sustainable show home.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 22: What approach to sustainable show-homes should we take?</p> <p>i. Rely on negotiating their provision on an individual site basis?</p> <p>ii. Require all developments that include a show-home to provide a sustainable show-home?</p> <p>iii. Require developments of over 15 dwellings to provide a sustainable show-home?</p>

Issue 23	Construction Methods
Key evidence	South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide SPD (2010)
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Policy DP/6 Construction Methods
Analysis	The construction process for any new development utilises a significant amount of resources, generates construction waste and spoil, and can adversely affect the amenity of surrounding occupiers and the local natural environment, through the generation of noise, smells and dust.

	<p>Soil is an important natural resource and is vital in supporting ecosystems, facilitating drainage and providing green spaces (which support biodiversity, absorb rainwater and improve drainage, control pollution, regulate temperatures and reduce noise pollution). During the construction process soil is at risk of erosion from wind and rain, becoming compacted by construction machinery which can lead to increased run-off and surface water flooding, and becoming contaminated with waste building materials which can harm its ability to support ecosystems.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that the planning system should protect and enhance soils and use natural resources prudently, including through the reuse of existing resources.</p> <p>It is important that the principles of sustainable development are taken account of during the construction process, and that any adverse impacts are minimised through the use of haul roads, restrictions on hours of operation, and the appropriate siting of storage.</p> <p>To minimise the adverse impacts generated by the construction process, the Local Plan should ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • careful management of materials already onsite (including soils) or brought to site to reduce the amount of waste produced and maximise the reuse or recycling of materials either onsite or locally; and • contractors are considerate to neighbouring occupiers, including through the application of restrictions on the hours of noisy operations, the provision of haul roads, and the siting of storage compounds to avoid impacts on existing businesses and residents. <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continue to include a construction methods policy in the Local Plan; or • construction methods should not be specified in the Local Plan.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 23: What approach should the Local Plan take to construction methods:</p> <p>i. Continue to include a construction methods policy?</p> <p>ii. Not specify construction methods in the Local Plan?</p>

Issue 24	Water Efficiency
Key evidence	Cambridge Area Water Cycle Strategy 2008 and 2011
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: Development Principles Chapter • Development Control Policies DPD: Policy NE/12 Water

	Conservation
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of water supply and demand considerations. New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change.</p> <p>In their Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP10)⁷ Cambridge Water Company identified that forecast demand could be met and the company is predicted to maintain a positive supply-demand balance up to 2035, based on planned growth rates from the East of England Plan 2008. The company plans to achieve 88% of billed households having meters by 2035 through an enhanced metering programme.</p> <p>Despite this, there are a number of issues which warrant particular attention to greater efficiency in this area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cambridge Water area is in an area of serious water stress as designated by the Environment Agency. This provides an indication of the areas of England where planning authorities can demonstrate local need for water efficient development. • High levels of development will increase resource demands, and bring demand closer to the available resources in the future, as noted by the Environment Agency in examining growth levels for the review of the East of England Plan. • The existing risk of sustainability reductions in deployable output that may be invoked by the Environment Agency under its Restoring Sustainable Abstractions Programme reducing licensed abstraction capacity in the future. • The high environmental cost of treating and supplying water (in terms of energy and carbon footprint). • Any further abstraction will have an impact on groundwater levels or river flows, even though these levels have been determined to be 'environmentally acceptable' by the Environment Agency by virtue of granting a licence. <p>The average person in the UK uses around 150 litres per person per day. The current Building Regulations already require physical measures to be included in new development aimed at encouraging reductions in water use to 125 litres per person per day (equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes Levels 1 and 2). These include dual</p>

⁷ Cambridge Water Company Water Resources Management Plan (Cambridge Water Company 2010) <http://www.cambridge-water.co.uk/customers/water-resources-management-plan>

flush toilets and water efficient taps, showers, fixtures and fittings. Higher levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes require greater levels of water efficiency.

The costs of achieving higher levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes were explored in the Cambridge Area Water Cycle Strategy 2011. Reducing water consumption to 105 litres per person per day (reflecting Code 3 or 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes), adds minimal costs (£268 per property), and can be achieved by using alternative fixtures and fittings which use less water. Reducing water consumption to 80 litres per person per day (reflecting Code 5 or 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes) requires further measures, potentially including rainwater or greywater recycling (for uses such as for flushing toilets). This can increase costs by £1,750 to £4,500 per dwelling, although this could be reduced by community scale schemes which serve a number of dwellings.

The development costs of seeking levels of water efficiency beyond Building Regulations needs to be balanced alongside other infrastructure priorities. It is also worth considering the implications for the occupiers of new housing. The Water Cycle Strategy estimates that achieving 80 litres per person per day would deliver savings to the end user of around £50 per person per year in water bills, and £20 per person per year for 105 litres, compared with the Building Regulations standard 125 litres.

Measures required to achieve Water Efficiency Standards in New Residential Developments

	Litres per person per day	Additional measures needed to achieve standard	Additional costs above current Building Regulations (Source: CLG 2010)	Estimated value of water saving per person per year
Building Regulations	125	Currently require: dual flush toilets and efficient taps, showers, fixtures and fittings	N/A	N/A
Code for Sustainable Homes 3 / 4	105	Low flush toilets and more water efficient taps, shower heads, washing machines and dishwashers	£268	£21
Code for Sustainable	80	Further efficiency in	£1,750 (for a flat) to £4,500	£50

	Homes 5 / 6		household taps; installation of lower fill baths; Greywater recycling (GWR) or rainwater harvesting (RWH)		
<p>Source: Adapted from table 3-3 of Cambridge Area Water Cycle Strategy 2011. Cost savings based on formula from paragraph 3.3.17 of Water Cycle Strategy.</p> <p>Existing Local Development Framework policies have set specific requirements for water efficiency in the existing growth areas (by requiring compliance with specific levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes), including water consumption of up to 105 litres per person per day for any dwellings approved on or before 31 March 2013 (up to a maximum of 50 dwellings) and water consumption of up to 80 litres per person per day for any dwellings approved on or after 1 April 2013 within the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan area.</p> <p>Higher standards could be set for specific types or sizes of development and flexibility could be written into the policy to enable the standards chosen to be increased over time. In 2016, the energy efficiency standards set out in Building Regulations are planned to increase to the equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5. The plan could require the higher equivalent water standards to coincide with this.</p> <p>Non-residential buildings, such as schools, community facilities, and offices, also have the potential to be more water efficient through installation of low flush toilets and urinals, aerated taps and showerheads, and through implementation of rainwater and greywater recycling systems.</p> <p>There is as yet no national equivalent for the Code for Sustainable Homes for non-domestic buildings, however the BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method) includes an assessment of water efficiency, and offers a practical way of demonstrating efficiency. An assessment could demonstrate how a building has achieved as close to the “exemplary” standard as possible.</p> <p>In the absence of a BREEAM assessment, an alternative approach would be to require developers to provide evidence in their Design and Access Statement of how they have maximised water efficiency, clearly setting out the alternative means of achieving water efficiency that are appropriate to their development. In most cases where significant building work is being undertaken, it is expected that</p>					

	<p>water reuse techniques will be incorporated. If this is not proposed, the reasons for not doing so should be set out in the Design and Access statement.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • do not include a policy and rely on national Building Regulations standards for water consumption; • seek additional measures such as water efficient fixtures and fittings, subject to viability, to achieve water consumption of less than 105 litres per person per day (equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Levels 3 and 4); or • seek grey water recycling or rainwater harvesting, subject to viability, to achieve water consumption of less than 80 litres per person per day (equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Levels 5 and 6).
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 24: What approach should the Local Plan take on water efficiency in new housing development? What are your views on the following options?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Rely on Building Regulations standards to reduce water use below the average existing levels. ii. Seek additional measures such as water efficient fixtures and fittings (to achieve equivalent of Code 3 or 4 of Code for Sustainable Homes), subject to financial viability. iii. Seek grey water or rainwater recycling (to achieve equivalent of code 5 or 6 of Code for Sustainable Homes), subject to financial viability. <p>Please provide any comments.</p>

Issue 25	Water Quality
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Area Water Cycle Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011) • Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010)
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: Policy NE/8 Groundwater • Development Control Policies DPD: Policy NE/9 Water and Drainage Infrastructure • Development Control Policies DPD: Policy NE/10 Foul Drainage – Alternative Drainage Systems
Analysis	<p>The EU Water Framework Directive requires all inland and coastal waters to achieve ‘good ecological status’ by 2015 or, where this is not possible, by 2021 or 2027. In South Cambridgeshire the majority of rivers are currently of moderate or poor ecological status.</p>

	<p>South Cambridgeshire District Council has a statutory duty to have regard to the Water Framework Directive, and to ensure there is no deterioration in water body quality due to any policy or action.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework requires planning to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution.</p> <p>New developments require water supply and foul water infrastructure. It is important that infrastructure is available when it is needed to serve development, in order to protect health and the environment.</p> <p>In much of the south east of the district the underlying geology is chalk, providing a significant source of groundwater which is used for public drinking water supply. It is particularly important that the quality of this water is protected from pollution in these areas.</p> <p>Development needs to include measures to address pollution from surface water run off. Depending on the source, this may require multiple treatment stages.</p> <p>In rural areas, some development takes places where there is no access to main sewers. It is important that development includes appropriate plant to treat effluent, in order to protect the water environment.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Policies are needed to protect and seek to enhance water quality.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 25:</p> <p>A: Have the right approaches to managing, protecting and enhancing water quality been identified?</p> <p>B: Are there any other issues which should be included?</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p>

Issue 26	Sustainable Drainage Systems
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Area Water Cycle Strategy 2008 and 2011 • Cambridge Area Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Policy DP/1 Sustainable Development
Analysis	The National Planning Policy Framework requires development to give priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems.

	<p>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) make use of techniques, such as infiltration and retention, which mimic runoff from the site in its natural state. Rainwater should be managed close to its source and on the surface where possible. As a result the water is stored and released slowly, reducing flood risk and improving water quality. Less surface runoff frees up capacity in our sewers, whilst more natural materials improve biodiversity and amenity. Examples of SuDS techniques include permeable paving, soakaways, green roofs, swales and ponds.</p> <p>SuDS are often seen as additions to development, and therefore do not fully realise their multi-functional benefits. To overcome this, SuDS need to be considered from the start of the design process.</p> <p>Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act (2010) requires SuDS in new and redeveloped sites in England. The Act establishes a Sustainable Drainage Systems Approving Body in unitary or county councils. This body must approve drainage systems in new developments and re-developments before construction begins. National Sustainable Drainage System Standards are being introduced, together with a greater role for Lead Flood Management Authorities (for this area Cambridgeshire County Council) in approving drainage schemes. Cambridgeshire is also producing local guidance regarding the implementation of SuDS.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: It is important that the Local Plan seeks to ensure that the design of development manages surface water in the most sustainable way, and the wider benefits for biodiversity, amenity, and water quality and secured.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 26: A: Have the right approaches to managing water and drainage sustainably been identified? B: Are there any other issues which should be included?</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p>

Issue 27	Flood Risk
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Area Water Cycle Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2008 and 2011) • Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010) • Cambridgeshire Surface Water Management Plan (2011)
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Policy NE/11 Flood Risk
Analysis	The National Planning Policy Framework states that ‘inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where

	<p>development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Local Plans should be supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and develop policies to manage flood risk from all sources, taking account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management bodies, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards. Local Plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • applying the sequential test; • if necessary, applying the exception test; • safeguarding land from development that is required for current and future flood management; • using opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding; and • where climate change is expected to increase flood risk so that some existing development may not be sustainable in the long-term, seeking opportunities to facilitate the relocation of development, including housing, to more sustainable locations.' <p>The Local Plan needs to include a policy on managing flood risk, to require the application of the risk based sequential approach to flood risk established through the National Planning Policy Framework and supporting Technical Guidance.</p> <p>As well as avoiding increasing flood risk elsewhere, some development sites will also offer opportunities to reduce flood risk, such as by reducing runoff rates. It is important these opportunities are secured.</p> <p>Policy needs to require consideration of all sources of flooding, and to require applicants to consider available sources of information, in particular the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and the Surface Water Management Plan.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire District Council, in partnership with Cambridge City Council, commissioned a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, which explores the nature and extent of flood risk across the area, taking account of the anticipated impacts of climate change. In addition, Cambridgeshire County Council, now the lead local flood management authority, has prepared a Surface Water Management Plan. These have been used to assess options for development for allocation in the local plan, and should be used to support the consideration of planning applications.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan needs to include appropriate policies for the</p>
--	--

	management of flood risk.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 27: A: Have the right approaches to managing flood risk been identified? B: Are there any other issues which should be included? Please provide any comments.

7. Delivering High Quality Places

Issue 28	Securing High Quality Design
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD 2010
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: Design of New Development (DP/2) • Development Criteria (DP/3) • Cumulative Development (DP5)
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning for sustainable development involves replacing poor design with good design. Planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p> <p>At paragraph 58 it states that, ‘Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; • establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit; • optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks; • respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation; • create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and • are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.’ <p>The Local Plan needs to establish design principles that new development will be expected to adhere to. The principles established in the policy option have been guided by the NPPF, the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter, and the District Design Guide. They are intended to encompass the range of issues that could affect sites of any scale, although their applicability will vary between site, use and location.</p> <p>The District Design Guide Design SPD expands on district-wide policies, and policies in individual Area Action Plans for major developments that may vary from the district-wide policies. It provides additional details on how they will be implemented. It sets out important design principles based on recognised good practice and explains key requirements of the District Council that will be taken into account when</p>

	<p>considering planning proposals.</p> <p>A further issue identified is whether specific guidance should be provided on the design and width of streets. This could address street character in terms of verges, tree planting, pavements, and sustainable drainage systems.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: None.</p> <p>A policy seeking high quality design is necessary to reflect the NPPF and to support delivery of sustainable development. However, there are a range of approaches regarding how this is delivered, including through the district design guide, or more local guidance.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 28:</p> <p>A: Have the right design principles been identified to achieve high quality design in all new developments?</p> <p>B: Should the Local Plan provide guidance on design of streets to improve the public realm, including minimum street widths and street trees?</p> <p>C: Do you think the Council should retain and update the District Design Guide?</p> <p>D: Would you like your village to produce its own design guide? If so, please let us know which village so that we can discuss how to take this forward with the local Parish Council.</p>

Issue 29	Public Art
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts and Culture Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2006) Arts and Cultural Strategy (the Arts Forum for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough 2007) South Cambridgeshire Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (2009)
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Control Policies DPD: Public Art (SF/6)
Analysis	<p>The District Council has an existing policy that encourages developers to allocate a proportion of the budget for the implementation of a carefully considered public art scheme. The policy is applied to residential developments comprising 10 or more dwellings, or other developments where the floorspace to be built is 1000m² gross or more, including office, manufacturing, warehousing and retail developments. On smaller developments encouragement should be given to developers to include Public Art within their scheme as a means of enhancing the quality of their development. The supporting text of the policy provides a guide figure of between 1% and 5% of the associated construction costs of a capital project.</p> <p>The public art policy was identified as a notable asset for generating commissions in the Arts and Cultural Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-</p>

	<p>Region.</p> <p>The benefits of Public Art relate to social, economic, environmental and cultural factors. Public Art can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively contribute to integrating village groups and neighbourhoods, promoting community cohesion through socially engaged arts activity. • Create unique images that, as symbols, can be used to promote places, generating pride of place and a sense of local identity and distinctiveness. • Enhance the fundamental principles of urban design, to better improve the quality of the built environment and create distinction and character. <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: There are general options regarding the approach to public art, and the form public art could take within developments.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 29: What approach do you think the Local Plan should take on public art?</p>

8. Protecting and Enhancing the Historic and Natural Environment

Issue 30	Landscape Character
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011) • South Cambridgeshire Landscape in New Developments Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2010 • South Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD 2010 • Natural England – National Character Areas
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: NE/4 Landscape Character Areas.
Analysis	<p>The European Landscape Convention requires the protection, management and planning of all European landscapes, rather than only the best areas. The importance of the landscape is reflected in national planning guidance; with the National Planning Policy Framework stating that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.</p> <p>The South Cambridgeshire landscape has several distinctive identified characters which reflect the underlying geology of the district. These have been identified by Natural England as five distinctive National Character Areas –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Fens • South Suffolk and North Essex Claylands • East Anglian Chalk • Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands • Bedfordshire Greensand Ridge <p>These ‘National Character Areas’ replace the former Landscape Character Areas which are described in detail in the Landscape in New Development SPD 2010 – this SPD will need to be amended to reflect this updated terminology.</p> <p>A key issue within South Cambridgeshire is that the distinctive character and quality of the district’s landscape has been eroded by changes made to the land as a result of agriculture or development. A policy could be included in the Local Plan to protect the landscape characters and should include consideration of the relevant National Character Area, and other available information including landscape character assessments. Further information could continue to be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (currently the Landscape SPD).</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Due to international and national policy requirements, the Local Plan will need to address landscape character.</p> <p>The Local Plan could include a policy to require development proposals to reflect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the landscape. This should include consideration of the relevant National Character Area, and other available information including landscape character assessments. Further information could continue to be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (currently the Landscape SPD).</p>
Final Issues	Question 30: Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring development

and Options Approaches	proposals to reflect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the landscape?
------------------------	--

Issue 31	Protecting high quality agricultural land
Key evidence	
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Control Policies DPD: NE17 Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that Local Planning Authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, Local Planning Authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire has a significant resource of good quality agricultural land. Agricultural land classification provides a uniform method for assessing the quality of farmland to enable informed choices to be made about its future use within the planning system. The most productive and flexible land falls into Grades 1 and 2 and Subgrade 3a and collectively comprises about one third of the agricultural land in England and Wales.</p> <p>Within the district there are significant areas of high quality agricultural land. Much of the best agricultural land lies around Cambridge and the larger settlements, which may be the most sustainable locations for future development. The need to identify and maintain a large supply of land for development means there is pressure for development of agricultural land.</p> <p>Existing policy seeks to protect the higher grade agricultural land from development unless it is allocated in the Local Development Framework or its sustainable location overrides the need to protect the land or the scheme does not involve much built development.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The NPPF requires the benefits of agricultural land to be considered. The Local Plan could seek to protect the best agricultural land within the district from significant development unless sustainability considerations and the need for the development outweigh the need to protect the agricultural value of the land.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 31: Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking to protect best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1,2, and 3a) from unplanned development?

Issue 32	Biodiversity
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Cambridgeshire Biodiversity SPD 2009 Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Control Policies DPD: NE/6 Biodiversity Development Control Policies DPD: NE/7 Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance
Analysis	South Cambridgeshire contains a range of important habitats and species.

However, one of the main features in biodiversity conservation is the extent of fragmentation of this resource, primarily due to the impact of modern agriculture. The main exception to this pattern is along the river corridors, most notably the Great Ouse, which serves as a focus for some of the most significant protected sites.

The Government has stated a commitment to improving the quality of the natural environment across England. The National Planning Policy Framework establishes that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;
- recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
- minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.

Local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged. When determining planning applications they should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity, if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

Existing policy establishes that development should aim to maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity, using opportunity for positive gain. Development that would have adverse significant impact should be refused, unless adequately mitigated or compensated for. Particular consideration should be given to priority species and habitats identified in the Biodiversity Action Plan.

There are important sites protected at the European level, Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation, and a number of other sites nearby. There are 39 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), designated as nationally important. There are also 113 County Wildlife sites and 7 Local Nature Reserves, non-statutory sites identified because they are rich in wildlife.

Policy is needed to apply appropriate protection, where planning permission would not be given for proposals which would have an unacceptable adverse impact, either directly or indirectly, on a site of biodiversity of geological importance. This must take account of the status and designation of the site.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

None. Reflecting national and international policy, the plan needs to include appropriate policies seeking to ensure that development proposals minimise negative impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible, and to provide appropriate protection to designated sites and species.

The Local Plan could require development to aim to maintain, enhance,

	restore or add to biodiversity, and seek to reduce habitat loss and fragmentation. Priorities for habitat creation could reflect biodiversity action plan targets, and creation of areas that link habitats. Further guidance could continue to be provided in the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 32:</p> <p>A: The Local Plan needs to protect and enhance biodiversity. Have we identified the right approaches?</p> <p>B: Do you think the Council should retain and update the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document?</p>

Issue 31	Green Infrastructure
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD SF/10 Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Development
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that Local planning authorities set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. This 'green infrastructure' refers to the network of multi-functional green-spaces and green-links, which can include country parks, wildlife habitats, rights of way, commons and greens, nature reserves, waterways and bodies of water bodies and other open spaces.</p> <p>In 2011 a partnership of local organisations including the Council, produced the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy. The strategy highlights the deficiencies in certain parts of the District regarding access to countryside open space. The level of growth planned for South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge will also put pressure on existing Green Infrastructure and will require proportionate investment to develop the Green Infrastructure network. Delivery of Green Infrastructure can contribute to improving strategic linkages and wildlife corridors, landscape character enhancement, protection and enhancement of biodiversity and habitat restoration, protection and enhancement of cultural heritage assets, climate change adaptation, and delivering public access to countryside open space.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy highlights that Green Infrastructure should be an integral part of growth sites in the district, mitigating the impacts of climate change, delivering a range of other objectives, and linking to the wider Green Infrastructure network. It therefore provides the strategic framework required by the NPPF.</p> <p>The Strategy has identified opportunities for long-term landscape and biodiversity improvements across Cambridgeshire, which the planning system can help to deliver.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Strategy draws on analysis carried by Natural England using Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt), to examine the level of publicly accessible natural greenspace provision in</p>

	<p>Cambridgeshire. It identified deficiencies in access in a number of areas to greenspace provision at various size thresholds</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Strategy identifies a range of opportunities for enhancement in and around the district, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wicken Fen Vision ○ West Cambridgeshire Hundreds Habitat Enhancement Project ○ Wimpole Cycle Link ○ Cambourne and Northstowe Large-scale public open space provision ○ Coton Countryside Reserve ○ Gog Magog Countryside Project ○ North Cambridge Heritage Trail ○ Cambridge Sport Lakes ○ Trumpington Meadows Country Park ○ Chalk Rivers project ○ Fowlmere Nature Reserve extension and development of facilities ○ Linear monuments ○ Woodland linkage project ○ Fens Waterways Link ○ The Environment Agency Ouse Washes Habitat Creation Project <p>There is an opportunity to enhance the role of gateway sites, such as the country parks at Milton and Wandlebury and Coton Countryside Reserve, which attract visitors and provide a way into the countryside, integrating them with the Green Infrastructure network and exploiting their collective value.</p> <p>The Local Plan could include a policy that expects all new development to contribute towards the provision of additional green infrastructure and the protection and enhancement of the district's existing green infrastructure. Specific opportunities may be identified in the Local Plan in relation to major development proposals.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: An option for the Local Plan could be that all new development should be expected to contribute towards the provision of additional green infrastructure and the protection and enhancement of the district's existing green infrastructure. Specific opportunities may be identified in the Local Plan in relation to major development proposals, subject to the viability of the development and local opinion</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 33:</p> <p>A: Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring development to provide or contribute towards new or enhanced Green Infrastructure?</p> <p>B: Are there other new Green Infrastructure projects that should be added?</p>

Issue 34	Impact of Development in the Green Belt
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Green Belt Study – (Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002)
Existing	Development Control Policies DPD

policies	GB/2 Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt GB/3 Mitigating the Impact of Development Adjoining the Green Belt
Analysis	<p>The Government has recently confirmed the importance it attaches to Green Belts in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.</p> <p>As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>The area of Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire comprises 23,000 hectares covering over 25% of the District. This means much of the District is affected by Green Belt policies particularly those villages surrounding Cambridge. There are two existing policies relating to mitigation of development. One policy seeks to mitigate the impact of development within Green Belt land and a second relates to development on land adjoining Green Belt. These policies ensure that any development that is proposed in or near the Green Belt must be located and designed so that it does not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt. Landscaping conditions will be attached to developments within the Green Belt and it is required that the planting is maintained to ensure the impact on the Green Belt is mitigated. On development adjoining the Green Belt will also need careful landscaping and high quality design to protect the purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: In order to protect the qualities of the Green Belt the plan needs to ensure impacts are appropriately addressed.</p> <p>The Local Plan could require that where development takes place in or adjoining the Green Belt; it is designed and appropriately landscaped so that it minimises its impact on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 34: Should the Local Plan include policies to ensure that development in and adjoining the Green Belt does not have an unacceptable impact on its rural character and openness?

Issue 35	Redevelopment in the Green Belt
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridge Green Belt Study – (Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002)
Existing policies	GB/4 Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt
Analysis	A number of ‘major development sites’ within the Cambridge Green Belt are currently identified within a policy where redevelopment and infill are permitted within the defined confines of these sites subject to there being no

	<p>adverse impact on the purposes of the Green Belt. The sites are Babraham Hall; Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospital and Girton College.</p> <p>Within the National Planning Policy Framework there is amended wording relating to infill development that would be appropriate in the Green Belt. Previously it was only 'major existing developed sites identified in adopted local plans' where redevelopment would be allowed. The revised wording is '...limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.'</p> <p>This revised wording could therefore mean that there is no longer a need for the existing policy since the national Green Belt policy will cover this aspect of redevelopment of sites within the Green Belt.</p> <p>However the policy also includes limitations on the redevelopment relating to the floor area, footprint, height and degree of impact. Whilst the revised wording does re-emphasis that the openness and the purposes of the Green Belt should not make an impact greater than the existing development it does not specify a limitation on the scale of the new buildings.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: An issue for the Local Plan is whether to rely on this national guidance, or whether more detailed guidance should be included in the Local Plan, addressing issues such as floor area, footprint, height and degree of impact from development.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 35: Regarding infilling on, or complete redevelopment of, previously developed sites in the Green Belt, should the Local Plan:</p> <p>i) Rely on National Planning Policy Framework guidance for determining planning applications; or</p> <p>ii) Include more detailed guidance regarding design, such as scale and height of development?</p>

Issue 36	Green Belt and Recreation Uses
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Green Belt Study – (Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002) • Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: GB/5 Recreation in the Green Belt
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land.</p>

	<p>The Cambridge Green Belt plays an important role in providing opportunities for access to the countryside for local people. This is recognised in the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy. The major urban extensions that are planned around Cambridge will create additional demands for access to Green Infrastructure at the same time as providing opportunities to deliver new areas of Green Infrastructure, both strategic and local. These areas of Green Infrastructure plays a key role in linking the urban area with the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>An existing policy provides encouraging proposals for use of Green Belt to increase or enhance access to the open countryside.</p> <p>The NPPF guidance on Green Belt continues to allow for the provision of ‘appropriate facilities’ for outdoor sport and recreation where it does not conflict with Green Belt purposes. With the growth proposed in the extensions around the City in the Cambridge Green Belt it is likely that land will become more intensively used, which could result in uses such as playing fields being relocated to, or specifically developed on, Green Belt land. It is important this is done in a way which protects the overall rural character of the Cambridge Green Belt, rather than creating a character more associated with the urban environment.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could continue to support recreation uses in the Green Belt, but require the cumulative impact of sports pitches and recreation development to be considered, to avoid the over-concentration of such sports grounds where it would be detrimental to the character and rural setting of Cambridge and the Green Belt villages.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 36: Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring the cumulative impact of sports pitches and recreation development to be considered, to avoid the over-concentration of such sports grounds where it would be detrimental to the character and rural setting of Cambridge and Green Belt villages?</p>

Issues 37 and 38	Protected Village Amenity Areas and Local Green Spaces
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011) • Adopted Proposals Map
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: CH/6 Protected Village Amenity Areas
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework has introduced a new designation for inclusion in local and neighbourhood plans. Local communities can identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.</p>

The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy recognises that within South Cambridgeshire there are many villages that feature small fields and paddocks and remnants of early enclosure, which provide a local landscape setting and opportunity for people to experience biodiversity and enjoy open spaces and other benefits. These should be considered to be an important part of local Green Infrastructure.

Within the District there are areas that are considered important to the amenity and character of villages which have been designated as Protected Village Amenity Areas (PVAA). As a result of the increasing pressure for development within villages it has been recognised that some open land needs to be protected to retain the character of these villages otherwise the blend of buildings and open space will be lost as a result of all the open spaces being developed. Some of the PVAs have important functions for the village such as allotments, recreation grounds and playing fields whilst others have an important amenity role. Not all PVAs have public access as some undeveloped areas which are important may be private gardens.

The NPPF provides a clear indication of when the designation of LGS should be used and it is apparent that there are similarities between PVAs and the new Local Green Spaces (LGSs). PVAs are located within villages and it is suggested a LGS should only be designated in 'reasonably close proximity to the community it serves'. Some existing PVAs could be described as 'green areas which are local in character' and others as 'green areas that hold a particular local significance because of their beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of their wildlife'. Also PVAs do not cover extensive tracts of land.

However there are some differences between PVAs and LGSs. The NPPF has stated that the local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts. The existing policy for PVAs does not permit development within or adjacent to such areas if it would impact on the character, amenity, tranquillity or function of the village. The policy managing development within Green Belt areas in South Cambridgeshire has slightly different restrictions since although it looks to protect the rural character of the land it does not include specific consideration of the amenity, tranquillity or function of the village. Also the policy mentions retaining the openness of Green Belt land. Whilst some existing PVAs would have this characteristic of openness and can be seen from viewpoints within a village others are enclosed or semi-enclosed areas.

Also within the PVA policy there are no exceptions to the development that are considered inappropriate whereas there are exceptions for Green Belt areas that are listed in the NPPF. A policy for LGS if it is to be consistent with Green Belt would therefore need to include such exceptions. For example limited infilling and affordable housing in villages could be permitted as could outdoor sports facilities or buildings for agriculture and forestry. Whilst some PVAs are already recreation grounds it would alter the character of others allocated for their tranquil character if a sports pitch were to be permitted development. Such development could alter the character of a PVA and therefore an LGS designation performs a different role to that of some PVAs.

Given the close link between some existing PVAs and the new designation

	<p>consideration should be given as to whether to re-designate some PVAAs as LGSs.</p> <p>The NPPF indicates that LGSs should be on green areas of particular importance to the local communities and therefore the communities within the District should be given the opportunity to put forward green areas as candidates for LGSs. It should be noted that the NPPF also says that the LGS designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. A LGS is seen as being an allocation of land that will extend beyond the period of a local plan – so like a Green Belt designation have a long lifetime of protection and not one that can be reviewed regularly.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could retain the approach to Protected Village Amenity Areas, in order to protect the character, amenity, tranquillity or function of valued open spaces in villages. The plan making process can offer the opportunity to review the sites included, or for new ones to be suggested.</p> <p>The Local Plan could identify Local Green Space sites, which could include some existing PVAA.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 37:</p> <p>A: Should the existing policy for Protected Village Amenity Areas be retained in the Local Plan?</p> <p>B: Please provide any comments, including if there are any existing PVAAs in villages (as shown on the Proposals Map) that you think should be removed or any new ones that should be identified.</p> <p>Question 38: Should the Local Plan identify any open spaces as Local Green Space and if so, what areas should be identified, including areas that may already be identified as Protected Village Amenity Areas?</p>

Issue 39	Important Countryside Frontages
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Control Policies DPD: CH/7 Important Countryside Frontages
Analysis	<p>In South Cambridgeshire there are many villages where land with a strong countryside character penetrates into the village or separates two parts of the built up area. Such land enhances the setting, character and appearance of the village by retaining a sense of a rural connection within a village. The frontage where this interface occurs has been identified to show that the frontage and the open countryside beyond should be kept open and free from development. Planning permission for development would be refused if it would compromise these purposes.</p> <p>The protection of important countryside frontages within villages is a policy that should be retained within the Local Plan if it is considered that retaining this rural interface within a village is of importance.</p>

	<p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could continue to protect important countryside frontages, because such land enhances the setting, character and appearance of the village by retaining a sense of a rural connection within a village.</p> <p>The plan making process also offers the opportunity for people to comment on the frontages currently identified, or suggest new ones that warrant protection</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 39: Should the existing policy for Important Countryside Frontages be retained in the Local Plan?</p> <p>Please provide any comments, including if there are any existing Important Countryside Frontages in villages that you think should be removed or any new ones that should be identified.</p>

Issue 40	Community Orchards and Allotments
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Trees and Development Sites SPD 2009 • Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011) • South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study Update 2012
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: NE/6 Biodiversity
Analysis	<p>Trees play an important role within the built and natural environment of South Cambridgeshire and can be found both within the open countryside as features in fields and hedgerows as well as within the villages providing a backdrop to buildings.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire District Council is supporting local people to establish or restore community orchards. They provide a range of benefits, including biodiversity, landscape enhancement, and fruit for local communities and a catalyst for the community to come together.</p> <p>There should be positive encouragement encourage for tree planting within villages by promoting community orchards or new woodland areas. New development could also be required to utilise opportunities for enhancing existing or delivering new orchards, as part of landscaping and open space proposals. Allotments are also valued locally.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: An option for the Local Plan is to include a policy to support the planting of community orchards or new woodland, or allotments in or near to villages. New development could also be required to utilise opportunities for enhancing existing or delivering new orchards or allotments, as part of landscaping and open space proposals.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 40: Should the Local Plan seek to encourage the creation of community orchards, new woodland areas or allotments in or near to villages and protect existing ones?</p>

Issue 41	River Cam and other waterways
-----------------	--------------------------------------

Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD SF/12 The River Cam
Analysis	<p>Rivers and streams are particularly important features of South Cambridgeshire. To the west and south are the chalk streams and tributaries of the River Cam, while to the north and east the River Great Ouse and the lower Cam form a natural boundary to the district at the fen edge. The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy recognises the importance of river corridors and floodplains as features in the landscape which are important as wildlife corridors. The River Cam is identified as a County Wildlife Site.</p> <p>The District Council recognises the importance of the river valley environments within South Cambridgeshire in contributing to the biodiversity of the District.</p> <p>In view of the specialist characteristics of river valley habitats and their importance to the biodiversity of the district as a whole, detailed guidance on the way in which development proposals should respect these habitats, natural features and species characteristics of the river valleys is included in the Council's Biodiversity Strategy Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>However, these waterways are also a major recreation and tourism resource, and careful management is required to preserve the special qualities that attract users.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: An issue to be considered in the Local Plan is whether a policy should be included for consideration of development proposals affecting the waterway networks in the district given their importance in providing wildlife corridors. This would need to be balanced between biodiversity, landscape, and the role for tourism and leisure, while also considering their crucial role for drainage.</p> <p>Alternatively the Local Plan could have no specific policy relating to waterways within the district, and rely on other policies within the Local Plan.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 41: Should a policy be developed for the consideration of development proposals affecting waterways, that seeks to maintain their crucial importance for drainage, whilst supporting their use as a recreation and biodiversity resource?

Issues 42	Heritage Assets
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD 2010 South Cambridgeshire Conservation Areas SPD 2010 South Cambridgeshire Listed Building SPD 2009
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CH/1 Historic Landscapes CH/2 Archaeological Sites CH/3 Listed buildings CH/4 Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building CH/5 Conservation Areas

Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises that one of the roles of the planning system is to contribute to protecting and enhancing the historic environment. Historic environment conservation and enhancement is a key part of sustainable A core planning principle listed in the NPPF is to 'conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations'.</p> <p>'Heritage assets' is an all-embracing term used to describe a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest.</p> <p>The NPPF states local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats</p> <p>Within South Cambridgeshire there is a wide range of heritage assets. The existing planning policies in the District consider historic landscapes; archaeological sites; listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas as separate policies</p> <p>Many of the heritage assets within South Cambridgeshire have statutory designations such as Scheduled Monuments, listed buildings and registered Parks and Gardens of Special Interest. Non- designated heritage assets are also of importance, such as other archaeological sites.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives</p> <p>The Local Plan needs to include policies to provide appropriate protection and enhancement of the historic environment, having regard to the importance of these sites.</p> <p>Existing planning policies in the district consider historic landscapes; archaeological sites; listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas as separate policies.</p> <p>An alternative option for the Local Plan is to follow the lead provided by the NPPF and cover all types of heritage assets in a single policy.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 42: Taking account of the importance of the heritage asset, should the Local Plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Individual policies addressing historic landscapes; archaeological sites; listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas; or ii) A single policy regarding the protection of all heritage assets

Issue 43	Assets of local importance
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD 2010 • South Cambridgeshire Conservation Areas SPD 2010 • South Cambridgeshire Listed Building SPD 2009
Existing	Development Control Policies DPD

policies	CH/1 Historic Landscapes CH/2 Archaeological Sites CH/3 Listed buildings CH/4 Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building CH/5 Conservation Areas
Analysis	<p>Others heritage assets in the District which are not designated are still of significant local historic importance and need to be protected- such as locally distinctive buildings that make a contribution to the townscape of a village. These may include assets that are important to a local community and contribute to the local character of a village but would not be of national significance. An issue for the plan is to consider developing a policy for such local assets and whether a formal list of these undesignated heritage assets should be created and published as a formal record. This record could include those assets that a local community consider to be of value within their area which may be identified as a result of neighbourhood planning. The policy could provide protection to these undesignated heritage assets when development proposals may impact on them Further guidance on these assets could be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: An option for the Local Plan is to consider protecting undesignated heritage assets to support appropriate consideration of their contribution to the local environment. This could include assets identified in Neighbourhood or Community Led Plans identified as locally important.</p> <p>A list of these assets and further guidance on their consideration could be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 43: A: Do you consider the Local Plan should protect undesignated heritage assets? B: If so, are there any specific buildings or other assets that should be included?</p>

Issue 44	Heritage Assets and adapting to climate change
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD 2010 • South Cambridgeshire Conservation Areas SPD 2010 • South Cambridgeshire Listed Building SPD 2009
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>The energy efficiency of buildings is covered in Chapter 6: Sustainable Development, Climate Change, Water and Flooding. However, the implications of energy efficient measures for historic buildings need particular consideration. There are opportunities in most historic buildings to improve energy conservation without causing harm, through measures such as secondary glazing, improved loft insulation using natural materials, low energy lighting, and use of fuel efficient boilers. In some situations, renewable energy technologies can also be installed without causing harm. Where harm would be caused by energy conservation or renewable energy measures, then less harmful measures should be considered. Where conflict is unavoidable, the benefits of the energy conservation measures and the</p>

	<p>extent of harm to the heritage significance should be weighed against public benefits.</p> <p>The South Cambridgeshire Listed Building SPD provides guidance on general sustainability, improving energy efficiency and renewable energy relating to listed buildings. An issue for the Local Plan is how climate change mitigation can be carried out on historic assets. Future detailed guidance could be provided in an SPD.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: An option for the Local Plan is to include a policy that provides guidance on how listed buildings can be adapted to improve their environmental performance. The preferred method would be the one that causes the least harm to the heritage significance of the building. The Council could encourage the use of innovative design solutions to mitigate climate change whilst making every effort to preserve the historic fabric by the use of traditional construction methods to achieve the adaptation.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 44: A: Should the Local Plan include a policy to provide guidance on how listed buildings and buildings in Conservation Areas can be adapted to improve their environmental performance? B: If so, where should the balance lie between visual impact, and the benefits to energy efficiency?</p>

9. Delivering High Quality Homes

Issue 45	Housing Density
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 • DETR Planning Research Programme - The Use of Density in Planning 1998 • The Council intends to publish a technical paper on Density matters to accompany the draft Local Plan
Existing policies	<p>Development Control Policies DPD Policy HG/1 The following AAP policies will remain in place: Cambridge East AAP Policy CE/7 Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP Policy CSF/7 North West Cambridge AAP Policy NW/5 Northstowe AAP Policy NS/7</p>
Analysis	<p>The existing plans making up the LDF contain a number of density policies. Those contained in Area Action Plans for the major developments would remain in place and would not be superseded by a new density policy in the Local Plan which would only replace policy HG/1. Policy HG/1 seeks average net densities of at least 30dph unless local circumstances require a different approach, and average net densities of at least 40dph should be achieved in more sustainable locations. The AAP generally seek to achieve average net densities of 50dph, with the exceptions of Cambridge East which sets a minimum of 50dph and seeks to achieve 75dph and the Northstowe AAP which seeks to achieve an average net density of 40dph.</p> <p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to set their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances. At paragraph 58 it also requires planning policies to ensure that amongst other considerations, developments optimise the potential of sites to accommodate development.</p> <p>The 1998 DETR research paper 'The use of Density in Planning' demonstrates that the area required to accommodate 400 dwellings decreases rapidly as density increases up to 30 dph. As density increases above 30 dph the area required decreases more slowly, with little change above 90 dph. In parallel with this the research identifies that the land required to provide social and community facilities falls rapidly as density increases up to 20 dph, beyond which the land requirement remains fairly constant, regardless of density. This indicates that subject to local circumstances it is most sustainable to develop at densities of 30 dph or more.</p> <p>Monitoring shows that in new developments completed between 1999 and 2011 the overall average net density of completed developments in South Cambridgeshire on sites of 9 or more dwellings rose from 27.6 dph in 1999 – 2001, to 36.1 dph in 2010-2011. The density of historical development in six villages has been assessed by looking at typical street blocks developed in three different time periods. Two villages have been selected from our Rural Centres, two from our Minor rural Centres and two from our Group Villages. The first time period is for developments prior to 1914, when no planning controls on</p>

	<p>development were in force. The second time period is 1914 to 2000, when planning controls were in force, but prior to the imposition of the minimum density requirement in PPG3. The third time period is 2000 from onwards when the minimum density requirement of 30 dph was in force until 2011. The assessment of net residential densities in sample villages, indicates that during the period 1914 to 2000 residential densities overall were significantly lower at circa 21.2 dph, than the pre 1914 level of circa 38.4 dph. Post 2000 residential density levels rose to circa 41.8 dph slightly above the pre 1914 levels. The figures also indicate that the pre 1914 residential densities decrease from villages in the rural centres category, to the minor rural centres category and further to the group villages' category.</p> <p>Ten completed development sites have been examined to assess the quality of developments, with particular reference to residential density and car parking. All assessed schemes are at densities greater than 30 dph, as the Council's current policy requirement is for a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare, unless there are exceptional local circumstances; with the categories assessed being between 30 and 39 dph, between 40 and 49 dph, between 50 and 59 dph and between 80 and 89 dph. Sites were selected in a variety of locations, the two growth areas of Orchard Park and Cambourne, the fringe of Cambridge and in South Cambridgeshire villages. The findings suggest that at densities of between 30 to 39 dph developers have developed house types and an approach to site and block layout that enables quality development to be produced, whilst at densities of greater than 80 dph developers are required to design specifically for the scheme resulting in good quality development. The greatest issues were seen at densities above 40 dph where developers sought to maintain the use of standard house types.</p> <p>The use of average net densities allows for a wide variation in density across a site; and especially on very large sites, this range of densities could extend from below 30 dph to above 100 dph. The proposed Cambridge Fringe density of 40 dph is in response to the distance of the sites in the District from the city centre, because they adjoin existing low density suburbs and in some cases because of their sensitive locations.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives</p> <p>Three alternative options have been identified. Not to include a density policy and rely on other Local Plan policies and the NPPF to protect amenity and ensure the efficient use of land. To include a policy setting an 30 dph minimum across the District, and to provide density standards depending on position in the settlement hierarchy.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 45: Which of the following options do you agree with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide no specific guidance on density ii. Include a policy with a density target of an average of 30 dph on a development but allowing for variation from site to site to reflect local circumstance

	<p>iii. Include a policy with higher average target densities in the most sustainable locations and lower average densities in the least sustainable but allowing for variation from site to site to reflect local circumstances.</p>
--	---

Issue 46	Housing Mix – House Types
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 • SCDC Housing Strategy 2012-2016 • Cambridge Housing Sub-Region - Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2010 www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/research/housing/ • The Lifetime Homes Standard (November 2011) www.lifetimehomes.org.uk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Econometrics population forecasting for South Cambridgeshire to 2031 • East of England Forecasting Model population runs for South Cambridgeshire to 2031
Existing policies	<p>Policy HG/2 Housing Mix The following AAP policies will remain in place: Cambridge East AAP Policy CE/7 Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP Policy CSF/7 North West Cambridge AAP Policy NW/7 Northstowe AAP Policy NS/7</p>
Analysis	<p>Policies in existing AAP will remain in place until that AAP is superseded. Policy HG/2 seeks affordable housing to meet identified needs, and in developments of up to 10 homes market properties should provide at least 40% 1 and 2 bedroom homes, approximately 25% 3 bedroom homes and 25% 4 or more bedroom homes. Larger developments to provide a mix of homes, including 1 and 2 bedroom homes, and secure a balanced community. A proportion of new dwellings should meet lifetime mobility standards.</p> <p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to plan for a mix of housing, based on demographic trends, market trends and the needs of groups such as families with children, older people, people with disabilities and others.</p> <p>The Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 records from page 60 that in the period before housing mix guidance was introduced locally the market trend was for delivery of large 4 bedroom or more properties with relatively few 1 and 2 bedroom properties being provided, and too few to address housing needs. It also records the impact of policy on the increasing provision of smaller properties over time.</p> <p>Surveys of the occupiers of new developments in Cambridgeshire illustrate the market preferences of buyers of new houses to buy the largest house that they can afford, with a significant proportion of 3 bedroom homes or larger being occupied by couples without children. Levels of ‘under-occupancy’ in the affordable housing sector being very low and the incidence of ‘over-occupancy’ much higher.</p>

	<p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives</p> <p>A number of alternative options have been identified. To not include a housing mix policy. To include a policy only on large sites or only on small sites. To apply housing mix policy only to market housing. If a mix is included that it seek a balance between demographic trends and market preferences.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 46: Which of the following options do you agree with?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide no guidance on housing mix (house types). ii. Include a policy on housing mix (house types) but only for market housing. iii. Any policy on housing mix (house types) should only apply to sites of 10 or more homes. iv. Any policy on housing mix (house types) should seek to balance demographic trends for smaller homes with market preferences for larger homes by seeking the provision of market housing as follows: At least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes, At least 30% 3 bedroom homes At least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes With a 10% allowance for flexibility which can be added to any of the above categories taking account of local circumstances.

Issue 47	Housing Mix
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 • SCDC Housing Strategy 2012-2016 • Cambridge Housing Sub-Region - Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2010 <p>www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/research/housing/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lifetime Homes Standard (November 2011) <p>www.lifetimehomes.org.uk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Econometrics population forecasting for South Cambridgeshire to 2031 • East of England Forecasting Model population runs for South Cambridgeshire to 2031
Existing policies	Policy HG/2 Housing Mix
Analysis	<p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to plan for a mix of housing, based on demographic trends, market trends and the needs of groups such as families with children, older people, people with disabilities and others.</p> <p>The Housing Strategy 2012-2016 and the available population forecasting for South Cambridgeshire to 2031 all record trends for a rapidly aging population. The LEFM Baseline scenario for example records an increase in the percentage of the population aged 65 and over growing from 17% to 24%. The growth in the population over 65</p>

	<p>forming a large proportion of the overall growth in the population of the District. This is clearly illustrated in Chapter 10 of the SHMA at figure 5.</p> <p>The Housing Strategy 2012-2016 from page 26 records data on people with disabilities in South Cambridgeshire. The 2008 Place Survey records 28% of respondents having some long term illness, disability or infirmity. For Council tenants this figure at march 2009 stood at 41%. The Private Sector House Condition Survey (2011/2012) records that 14.3% of such households contain at least one member with a long-term illness or disability. Of these households 45% suffered mobility problems (6.43% of all private sector households). From page 65 the strategy records the pressure on national and local budgets to support vulnerable people in the District. From page 70 it refers to how the Council can support people to live in their own homes as their mobility declines. The SHMA at Chapter 34 table 9 records how the percentage of frailty increases as populations age with 6% of men and 7% of women classified as frail in the 64-74 age band. Further background information can be found in Chapter 35.</p> <p>The Lifetime Homes Standard (November 2011) is a widely used national standard for ensuring that the spaces and features in new homes can readily meet the needs of most people, including those with reduced mobility. The Government's strategy requires all new housing built with public funding to meet the Lifetime Home standard by 2011. There have been a number of studies into the costs and benefits of building to the Lifetime Homes standard. These have concluded that the costs range from around £550 to £1650 per dwelling.</p> <p>Having homes built to the Lifetime Homes Standard helps to ensure that housing suits householders' needs and changing circumstances. Whilst lifetime homes can accommodate or adapt to the needs of many wheelchair users, the standards do not match the enhanced accessibility provided by a property constructed to the Wheelchair Housing Design standards. At present provision of fully wheelchair accessible housing is only made as part of the affordable housing element of schemes and in response to identified need.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Choices exist concerning our approach to housing mix to provide for changing needs and reduced mobility. Two alternative approaches have been identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide no guidance on making provision in new developments for those with reduced mobility and an ageing population. Provision would be regulated by the Building Regulations which currently do not go so far as the Lifetime Homes Standard. ii. Include a policy in the Local Plan to require 5% of market housing and all affordable housing to meet Lifetime Homes standards. The policy would not require a set provision for fully wheelchair accessible housing. Such provision to be limited to the affordable housing element of developments and then only
--	---

	in response to an identified need.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 47: What approach do you think the new Local Plan should take to securing houses adapted to meet the needs of people with reduced mobility, looking at the following options?</p> <p>i) Provide no guidance on the provision of housing for people with reduced mobility.</p> <p>ii) All affordable and 5% of market housing should be designed to Lifetime Homes standards.</p>

Issue 48	Affordable Housing
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 • SCDC Housing Strategy 2012-2016 • Cambridge Housing Sub-Region - Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2010 • The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2012 • Settlement summaries of site suitability drawn from the SHLAA and SA assessments • CLG House price and sales indices
Existing policies	<p>Policy HG/3 Affordable Housing Policy HG/4 Affordable Housing Subsidy The following AAP policies will remain in place: Cambridge East AAP Policy CE/7 Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP Policy CSF/7 North West Cambridge AAP Policy NW/6 and NW/7 Northstowe AAP Policy NS/7</p>
Analysis	<p>Policies in existing AAP will remain in place until that AAP is superseded. Under policy HG/3 housing developments will only be permitted if they provide an agreed mix of affordable housing amounting to 40% or more of the additional houses on site. Account is taken of viability and the achievement of mixed and balanced communities. Policy HG/4 allows for the amount of affordable housing to be reduced where circumstances have changed between the grant of planning permission and implementation.</p> <p>The NPPF states that where there is a need for affordable housing, Local Plans should set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be justified. The policies should contribute to the creation of mixed and balanced communities and be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time.</p> <p>The Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 from page 49 records the impact of existing affordable housing policies. In the last monitoring year 40% of homes permitted on sites of two or more dwellings were affordable fully meeting the policy target (205 homes). Since then planning permission has been granted for other schemes providing 40% affordable housing and also for a 950 home addition to Cambourne where viability evidence was accepted that provides for 30% affordable housing.</p>

	<p>The SHMA provides a detailed calculation for each district to assess the need for affordable housing using guidance from the Department of Community and Local Government. (SHMA Chapter 27 Identifying Housing Need). For South Cambridgeshire the full information is contained in Table 11 of the SHMA – this was published in September 2011. It identifies a total net annual need for 1,372 affordable homes over the next 5 years (1,474 in a soon to be published SHMA update), including taking account of the backlog. Newly arising annual need is for 527 affordable homes (431 in the soon to be published update). This compares with the annual housing requirement for all types of housing in the Core Strategy of 1,174 dwellings, a figure that the latest forecasts have broadly supported looking ahead to 2031. Taken together with the backlog, this is clearly significantly in excess of the 40% affordable housing that is sought on new market housing schemes for 2 or more dwellings.</p> <p>The Housing Strategy 2012-2016 at page 40 sets out the Council approach to funding for new affordable housing in the context of the reduced availability of Government subsidy. The reduced availability of subsidy will reduce the amount of social rented housing that can be delivered and increase the amount of affordable rented housing (which requires less subsidy).</p> <p>The SHLAA 2012 includes an assessment of the viability of all the submitted sites at the current 40% affordable housing policy position together with an assumed rate of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It concludes that the majority of sites would be viable to develop at that level. Higher (50%) and lower (30%) affordable housing policy positions were also tested. These tests show that more sites would be viable at 30% and less sites would be viable at a 50% affordable housing policy position. The viability evidence submitted to justify the 30% affordable housing provision at Cambourne indicates that given the scale of infrastructure needed to implement very large urban extensions and new settlements, that in current market conditions 40% affordable housing can sometimes be difficult to achieve. Viability testing for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment also reveals a similar picture of borderline viability in current market conditions regarding the provision of 40% affordable housing in those parts of the District with lower house prices.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above analysis, the current adverse market conditions are unlikely to apply to the whole of the period to 2031 and a recovery can be expected in line with past recoveries from economic slowdowns. The Local Plan policy towards affordable housing must be sufficiently flexible to take account of current and changing market conditions over time and this approach is also required by the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The existing policy applies to developments in which there is a net increase in dwellings on a site (which is why it applies to developments of 2 or more dwellings). There is anecdotal evidence to show that having a low threshold has reduced the amount of small sites coming forward for development. For very small schemes the</p>
--	---

	<p>net number of new homes will be too small to result in a requirement for the on-site provision of affordable housing leaving provision to be made via a commuted payment in lieu of on-site provision.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives</p> <p>Given the scale of need it would not be reasonable to stop seeking affordable housing contributions from housing development schemes, but choices exist concerning our approach to the target for affordable housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. We could choose to maintain the current 40% level of affordable housing provided it is accompanied by policy provisions which allow greater flexibility to take account of current and changing market conditions over time. Evidence from the Annual Monitoring Report shows that in almost all cases the Council has been able to secure 40% affordable housing from new housing development, either on site or via financial contributions as an exception to the normal policy of provision on site. However it is proving to be challenging to achieve this level for very large strategic scale sites and there is viability evidence undertaken as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment which shows that achieving this level currently in some parts of the district with low house prices would threaten the viability of development. ii. A specific reduction in the level of affordable housing to be sought to 30% for very large strategic scale sites and in those parts of the district with low house prices, with 40% elsewhere. Such a change could be accompanied by policy text which would allow flexibility to increase the level to 40% in response to changing market conditions over time. <p>A separate issue is the appropriate threshold for provision of affordable housing to be made. There is evidence that the current threshold of a scheme size of 2 dwellings is discouraging small scale development by placing a greater requirement on very small schemes. The Council could increase the threshold to 3 or more, subject to viability, to encourage more small scale developments to come forward.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 48: A: What target should the Local Plan include to address the need for affordable housing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The target for affordable housing remains at 40% of the number of dwellings granted planning permission accompanied by policy provisions which explicitly allow greater flexibility to take account of current and changing market conditions over time. ii) The target for affordable housing is reduced to 30% of the number of dwellings granted planning permission in relation to very large strategic scale sites and in those parts of the district with low house prices and remains at 40% elsewhere. Such a change could allow flexibility to increase the level to 40% across the district in response to changing market conditions over time.

	B: The threshold for seeking affordable housing provision could be increased to 3 dwellings or another higher number. What number would you prefer and why?
--	--

Issue 49	Exception Sites Affordable Housing
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 • Village Housing Needs Surveys (Cambridge Su Regional Rural Housing Enabling Project led by Cambridgeshire ACRE) • SCDC Housing Strategy 2012-2016 • Cambridge Housing Sub-Region - Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2010 • The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2012 • Settlement summaries of site suitability drawn from the SHLAA and SA assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England 2011 • National Self Build Action Plan 2011 • Self-build as a Volume Housebuilding Solution 2008 • http://www.selfbuildportal.org.uk/
Existing policies	Policy HG/5 Exceptions sites for Affordable Housing
Analysis	<p>An exception site is currently a site that provides 100% affordable housing located within or adjoining a rural settlement, as an exception to normal planning policy.</p> <p>The Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 at page 51 records the completion of 313 homes on rural exception sites between 2004/2005 and 2010/2011 an average of 85 per year.</p> <p>The Village Housing Needs Surveys reveal a need for 743 new affordable homes in rural villages, of which 69 have been provided to date through the existing exception site policy HG/5. Work continues in those villages where a need has been identified but not yet met to find suitable sites to develop affordable housing. Some villages only need a couple of affordable housing units, which currently makes them unviable for affordable purposes, but if the needs of neighbouring villages can be combined a scheme may be more viable.</p> <p>The NPPF supports the use of rural exception sites to meet local needs and asks Local Planning Authorities to consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs.</p> <p>The Council has experienced a number of practical difficulties with implementation of the policy. Many villages have a need for affordable housing but not at a level that could support a housing development unless the needs of a number of villages could be considered together.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives</p> <p>The Local Plan could continue to require that 100% of the housing</p>

	<p>provided on exception sites is affordable. However, it is no longer expected that there will be government grant available to help fund affordable housing and therefore some new method needs to be identified to help secure funding for affordable houses on exceptions sites if such sites are to continue to come forward. As set out in the NPPF, the proposed method is to allow some market housing to help cross fund affordable housing. Options are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. To allow the minimum amount of market housing necessary on an exception site make the provision of significant affordable housing viable. ii. Considering the wider issue of housing provision in smaller villages as discussed in Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy, if there is a desire to provide for a little more market housing to achieve dual objectives of securing affordable housing and also some limited additional market housing in villages, the level could be set at a higher level than 40% so that a greater proportion of affordable housing is secured than on normal market sites. <p>See also the consideration of village frameworks at Issue 15. The two issues need to be considered together and if there is a desire to see greater flexibility at villages, this will help inform a decision on which approach may best target meeting local housing needs, having considered whether there is a desire to continue to secure exceptions sites in some form. See also Issue 7 on Localism.</p> <p>A further issue is whether it would provide greater flexibility in providing for local needs if the exception site policy allowed the housing needs of a group of neighbouring villages to be taken into account in bringing forward an exception site, particularly to assist those villages where need is very low and it is proving difficult to identify suitable exception sites or villages where need is high but there are no suitable exception sites. This would allow the occupation of exception site affordable housing to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those resident in the parish within which the exception site is located; and • Those resident in the group of neighbouring villages even if outside the parish; and • Those who have an employment connection to the village within which the exception site is located; and • Those who have a family connection to that local community.
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 49:</p> <p>A. What approach do you think the Local Plan should take to affordable housing on rural exception sites?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Allow the minimum amount of market housing necessary on exception sites to make the affordable housing viable? ii) Provide more market housing to support local communities, the Local Plan could allow a greater amount of market housing on exception sites to support the provision of a significant amount of affordable housing. <p>B. Do you think the Local Plan should allow greater flexibility in the</p>

	occupation of exception site affordable housing to include the needs of a group of neighbouring villages?
--	---

Issue 50	Residential Space Standards
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homes and Communities Agency's (HCA) Housing Quality Indicators (HQI) • Examples of space standards already included in Local Planning documents from other local planning authorities. • 1985 Housing Act (bedroom sizes)
Existing policies	None
Analysis	<p>Historically, there has been very limited national guidance on the issues connected with space standards within and around the home. However, Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) did provide support for the development of residential space and layout standards although none are explicit about what such guidance should contain. The National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Planning Authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future democratic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as families with children, the elderly and people with disabilities. If homes are to have a long and sustainable life, they must offer functional and adaptable spaces that meet the needs of such different groups.</p> <p>Furthermore, the pressure for housing along with the cost of land and the need for developers to ensure that buyers can afford to buy, means that internal and external space have been reduced in market housing over the years. UK homes usually have less internal floor space than those in Europe and this can result in households choosing (where they can afford to), to buy a house with more bedrooms than they need to gain additional living space on the ground floor of a property.</p> <p>A number of other Local Authorities have started to set out their own space standards: The Draft London Housing Design Guide, and the Ashford Borough Council Residential space and layout SPD include standards which are based on existing Lifetime Homes standards and basic furniture and activity spaces derived from HCA's Housing Quality Indicators. Most of the Local Authorities which are already using space standards are those located in the London Boroughs, these are again derived from existing HCA standards, but one notable exception is the Mid-Sussex District Council which has produced standards based on those originally adopted by English Partnerships.</p> <p>Other common problems that can be addressed by such standards include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring that there is adequate natural light and ventilation to all habitable rooms. • Provision of adequate internal and external space including bedroom sizes and kitchens that have adequate circulation space for the anticipated use and that there is sufficient recreational space • Minimising noise disturbance by ensuring that bedrooms are located on the aspect furthest from a known regular noise generating

	<p>sources including busy roads and railway lines. This may be less costly than installing additional sound insulation.</p> <p>Potential for reasonable alternatives Three alternative options have been identified. If no guidance is provided on space standards in new market housing would essentially be controlled by the market and what people want to buy and can afford to buy.</p> <p>Guidance could either include space and layout standards in the Local Plan or include a more general policy in the Local Plan and include the space and layout standards in a Supplementary Planning Document, this latter option would allow the standards to be more easily changed if national standards change or if experience points to the need for changes to better meet local conditions.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 50: Do you think that new homes are often too small? How do you think we should deal with the size of new homes?</p> <p>i) Not include a policy on residential space standards in the Local Plan.</p> <p>ii) Include a policy on residential space standards in the Local Plan which would cover both affordable and market housing and which would be consistent with national standards set by the Homes and Communities Agency.</p> <p>iii) Include a more general policy on residential space standards in the Local Plan and include the actual standards in a Supplementary Planning Document.</p>

Issue 51	Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning application decision notices and appeal decisions concerning policy HG/6 • Submission from Great Abington Parish Council dated May 2012, concerning extensions to dwellings in the Land Settlement Association area.
Existing policies	Policy HG/6 Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside.
Analysis	<p>Policy HG/6 is intended to prevent harm to the amenity of the countryside through inappropriate development and to help protect the stock of small and medium sized dwellings in the countryside because of the level of need for such dwellings. It imposes a limit on new floorspace or volume of 50% of the original building.</p> <p>Implementation of the policy has been attended by a number of contrary decisions where the policy has been overturned at planning application stage and on appeal.</p> <p>S/1123/08/F - 91% increase in volume. Allowed on appeal. No effect on the character and appearance of the countryside.</p> <p>S/0668/10/F – 100% plus increase in floor area. Allowed on appeal. No effect on the character and appearance of the countryside.</p> <p>S/1380/11 – Extension above 50% volume approved.</p>

	<p>S/0064/08/F – 95% increase in floor area. Recommended for refusal, approved by Planning Committee.</p> <p>The policy actively seeks to prevent extensions which would enable the conversion of existing properties into two dwellings which will have had the effect of preventing the creation of additional small dwellings in the countryside because of concerns that the location of such dwellings is unsustainable usually being distant from services and facilities and not well served by public transport. These concerns are real but should be balanced by the reasonable expectation that the number of such new dwellings</p> <p>Potential for reasonable alternatives</p> <p>The Local Plan could:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Delete the policy and rely on design policies to consider matters such as design quality, local character, traffic, countryside and landscape character and the scale and nature of the development. ii. Include a simplified version of the policy which would remove limitations concerning height, floorspace, volume and the requirement for the extension to be in scale and character with the existing dwelling (relying on the design policies to ensure design quality and amenity). iii. Include a simplified version of the policy as in b, which would in addition remove limitations concerning the creation of a separate dwelling.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 51: How do you think the Local Plan should deal with extensions to dwellings in the countryside?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Not include a policy. ii) Include a simplified version of the policy requiring the extension to be in scale and character with the existing dwelling. iii) Include a simplified version of the policy as in b), but also remove from it limitations concerning the creation of a separate dwelling.

Issue 52	Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anecdotal comments from Development Control officers that when policy HG/7 is explained to prospective applicants for planning permission to extend a house, the outcome is usually that no planning application is made and the property is extended under the General Permitted Development Order. • Housing Strategy for England 2011 (HMG) • Self Build as a Volume House Building Solution 2008 (NASBA)
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: Policy HG/7 Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside
Analysis	<p>Many dwellings in the countryside (outside village development frameworks) were built at a time when families had few possessions and were used to living in cramped crowded conditions. These</p>

	<p> dwellings although small, often sit on large plots of land. Today these properties can be ill-suited for modern family life but remain expensive to purchase or rent because of the land that comes with the dwelling. Such properties are found across the district but with a notable concentration at the Land Settlement Association Estate at Great Abington. </p> <p> The existing policy includes a rule to prevent increases in volume greater than 15% of the original building. Implementation of the policy has often been sidestepped by owners exercising their General Permitted Development Order rights to expand their homes (up to a 15% volume increase). This takes them outside the ambit of planning control altogether but can often result in accommodation which would not have been the preferred solution for the owner. </p> <p> This policy may also have had the unintended effects of preventing the reuse of large housing plots to provide high quality executive homes, and for small and medium sized plots, of preventing their use for self-build housing in that one key attraction of self-build is to allow people to live in a more spacious home than could otherwise have been afforded. The NPPF states that the needs of people wishing to build their own homes should be taken into account in the planned mix of housing to be provided. The Government wants to support more people to build their own homes and in the Housing Strategy for England 2011 consideration is given to Custom Built Homes. The Custom Build industry is important for the national economy. It is worth approximately £3.6 billion a year, safeguarding and creating new jobs, strengthening the construction supply chain and making a real contribution to local economies. Currently custom home builders are building as many homes each year as each of individual volume housebuilders, with around 13,800 custom homes completed in the UK in 2010/11. Custom Build Housing also brings other benefits, providing affordable bespoke-designed market housing, promoting design quality, environmental sustainability, driving innovation in building techniques and entrepreneurialism. </p> <p> Reports on self-build have identified the main problem to the expansion of self-build as the availability of suitable plots of land. The report 'Self Build as a Volume Housebuilding Solution 2008' states that "at present there are many more people seeking suitable sites, than there are plots available. At any one time there are around 6,000 plots listed in the UK; yet there are tens of thousands of people chasing them; perhaps as many as 50,000. Bear in mind too that many of the sites that are available are in parts of the UK where there is less demand (for example in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland), and some of the sites are not well suited to housing (backing onto railway lines or motorways, for example). In urban areas site finding problems are often compounded as small pockets of land suitable for self builders only very rarely become available and they are often prohibitively expensive. And in rural areas – where many self builders would prefer to build – land availability is constrained by tight planning regulations or Green Belt restrictions." </p> <p> Potential for reasonable alternatives: </p>
--	---

	<p>Two alternative options have been identified.</p> <p>i. Keep the existing policy and continue to limit replacement dwellings in the countryside to being no more than 15% larger than the dwelling they replace; or</p> <p>ii. Keep the requirement that the use of the dwelling has not been abandoned and that caravans will not be permitted to be replaced by permanent dwellings but delete the remainder of the policy and rely on the design policies of the Local Plan to consider such matters as design quality, scale, local character and countryside impact.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 52: How do you think the Local Plan should address the issue of replacing existing housing in the countryside?</p> <p>i) Keep the existing policy and continue to limit replacement dwellings in the countryside to being no more than 15% larger than the dwelling they replace.</p> <p>ii) Include a less restrictive policy on replacement dwellings in the countryside.</p>

Issue 53	Development of Residential Gardens
Key evidence	N/A
Existing policies	N/A
Analysis	<p>The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to consider the case for setting out policies to resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example when development would cause harm to the local area.</p> <p>Government planning guidance before June 2010 classified residential gardens as previously developed land (PDL), and strongly encouraged local planning authorities to achieve the national target of 60% of residential development being on PDL. This led to concerns about overdevelopment of neighbourhoods and 'garden grabbing'. The new Government in 2010 took action to remove gardens from the PDL classification in recognition that many local authorities felt forced into granting planning permission for unwanted development on garden land - simply to maintain the brownfield target.</p> <p>Proposals for the residential development of gardens in South Cambridgeshire have led to concerns including impacts on residential amenity, local character, heritage and traffic. Where acceptable however they can make use of large garden plots in locations close to existing services and facilities and reduce the need for development in the open countryside.</p> <p>In some cases, development on gardens may be appropriate as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces the need to extend development into the countryside; • Creates new homes without the need for significant increased infrastructure provision; • Provides better use of land in areas where people no longer demand large gardens due to lifestyle changes; and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides small sites appropriate for local developers who employ local people. <p>Arguments against developing on gardens include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased building mass; • Loss of or change in local character; • Increased population density; • A gradual associated increase in demand on local infrastructure; • Loss of green space and paving over gardens; • A reduction in habitats and biodiversity; and • An increased risk of flash flooding due to increased run off. <p>In considering proposed development on residential gardens the following factors are taken into account: local character and the implications for residential amenity, siting, design, scale, materials, access, traffic and parking, heritage, biodiversity and trees, and implications for the development of adjoining sites.</p> <p>Potential for reasonable alternatives</p> <p>Two alternative options have been identified.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Seek to prevent the loss of residential gardens except where it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be no harm to local character. ii. Allow for development of residential gardens in principle so long as the proposed development is consistent with the design policies of the Local Plan.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 53: What do you think the Local Plan should say about the development of residential gardens? In seeking to resist inappropriate development should the plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Seek to prevent the loss of residential gardens except where it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be no harm to local character. iv. Allow for development of residential gardens in principle so long as the proposed development is consistent with the design policies of the Local Plan.

Issue 54	Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside
Key evidence	N/A
Existing policies	Policy HG/8 Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential use
Analysis	South Cambridgeshire has a rich heritage of agricultural buildings which are no longer needed for agricultural purposes. The policy in the previous plan was to prioritise their future use for employment purposes and only exceptionally for residential conversion in order to concentrate housing development within our larger villages where residents would have better access to services, facilities and public transport.

	<p>However the NPPF has changed Government planning policy to be less restrictive stating that Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as: The essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside; or Where the development would be the best viable use of a heritage asset or would otherwise help to secure the future of heritage assets; or Where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting.</p> <p>Potential for reasonable alternatives</p> <p>Two alternative options have been identified.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Not include a specific policy and rely on that in the NPPF. ii. Include a policy based on the NPPF taking account of local circumstances, setting out the factors that would be taken into account, including whether the building is disused or redundant, the degree of reconstruction required, the need for extensions, their scale and impact, and scope for enhancement of setting.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 54: How do you think the Local Plan should address reuse of buildings in the countryside?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Not include a policy on the re-use of buildings in the countryside for residential use? ii) Include a policy on the re-use of buildings in the countryside for residential use setting out what factors would be taken into account.

Issue 55	Working at Home
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour Force Surveys
Existing policies	HG/8 section 5
Analysis	<p>A growing number of people are working at home either full time or part time and in self-employment or as an alternative to going into the office. Home working can help to maintain economic prosperity and employment and relive commuting pressure on our roads, and can be expected to grow further as rural broadband speeds increase. The policies of the Local Plan can help or hinder this growth. Normally the use of part of an existing dwelling for homeworking will not require planning permission being ancillary to the main residential use. The level of demand for new purpose built properties designed to enable a wide range of home working may have been held back by the lack of a specific plan policy to encourage such provision.</p> <p>Analysis of data from the UK Labour Force Survey shows a continued rise in the number of people working mainly from home. At the end of 2009, 12.8% of the workforce (3.7 million people) worked mainly at or from home. This is a 21% increase since 2001. The region with the highest level of homeworking is the South West, at 15.6%, followed by</p>

	<p>the South East (15.2%) and the East of England (14%). Homeworking is more prevalent in rural areas in the UK. At the end of 2009, 18.88% of the rural workforce was working at/from home, compared to 11.24% of the urban workforce. The proportion of rural workers who are self-employed homeworkers is 12.24%, almost double the urban figure of 6.75%. At least two-thirds of rural homeworkers are self-employed. However, the number of employees who work part of the time from home is now at around the 20% mark. Future growth is expected as more employees work part-time from home, and some who now work part-time increase the number of days they spend away from the office.</p> <p>Potential for reasonable alternatives</p> <p>The Local Plan could not include a specific policy on the issue and rely on other plan policies and the policy of the NPPF that where a plan is silent on an issue grant planning permission unless the adverse impacts of doing so would outweigh the benefits of the development. Alternatively it could include a policy on working at home stating that proposals will be approved unless there would be an effective loss of residential use, or there would be unacceptable impacts on factors such as residential amenity, local character, heritage assets, and traffic and parking.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 55: What approach should the Local Plan take to working at home?</p> <p>i) Not include a policy on working at home and rely on the other policies of the Local Plan and the NPPF to consider proposals.</p> <p>ii) Include a policy on working at home stating that proposals will be approved unless there would be an effective loss of residential use, or there would be unacceptable impacts on factors such as residential amenity, local character, heritage assets, and traffic and parking.</p>

Issue 56	Countryside Dwellings of Exceptional Quality
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2010-2015 • The Cambridge Cluster at 50 (Final report to EEDA March 2011) • The NPPF
Existing policies	N/A
Analysis	<p>There is some evidence of an unfulfilled demand for large high quality homes in the £1 million plus category suitable for business executives. The development of such homes in the district could have been constrained by policy HG/7 on replacement dwellings in the countryside which limits volume increases to 15% of the original and by other policies which seek to prevent the construction of isolated homes in the countryside. The lack of such homes could have had some impact on economic growth if it has affected executive recruitment. The NPPF includes policy guidance to avoid the construction of isolated country homes which may be suitable for such</p>

	<p>executives unless there are special circumstances such as the exceptional quality and innovative nature of the design, that it enhance its immediate setting and that it is sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. A number of reasonable options have been put forward for consideration and comment to address these issues.</p> <p>Potential for reasonable alternatives</p> <p>Two alternative options have been identified. To rely on the Local Plan policies concerning design and replacement houses in the countryside and the NPPF, to control such proposals, or alternatively to introduce a new policy on the issue in the plan, with criteria based upon the NPPF guidance and taking into account local circumstances.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 56: What approach should the Local Plan take to new countryside homes of exceptional quality?</p> <p>i) Not include such a policy. ii) Include a policy on exceptional homes in the countryside.</p>

Issue 57	Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 (plus consideration by the South Cambridgeshire Housing Portfolio Holder Meeting 13.6.12) • Gypsy and Traveller Community Strategy 2010-2013 • Gypsy and Traveller DPD consultation documents and public consultation responses • Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – Good Practice Guide (CLG 2008) • Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 • Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (CLG 2012)
Existing policies	South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Policy CNF6
	<p>National planning policy requires local planning authorities to plan for the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople through the plan making process, in a similar way to how it would plan to meet other housing needs. Where there is an unmet need, Local Plans have to identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of pitches against their locally set targets, and identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years six to ten and, where possible, for years 11-15.</p> <p>When the Council started work on its Gypsy and Traveller DPD, regional plans were being prepared that would set targets for the number of pitches to be delivered. The East of England plan (adopted in July 2009) determined that all districts should deliver sites, and that some of the need identified in areas with the highest levels of existing provision, like South Cambridgeshire, should be met by surrounding areas with lower levels of provision, in order to aid choice, provide greater equity between districts, and speed up delivery. New government guidance published in March 2012 advises that Local Planning Authorities should set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely</p>

permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in their area, working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities.

To help inform the development of a local target, the Council joined forces with other local authorities in Cambridgeshire, as well as parts of Norfolk and Suffolk, to commission an update of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment that was last completed in 2006.

Future Gypsy and Traveller need in South Cambridgeshire (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011, as modified following further consideration by the Housing Portfolio Holder meeting 13.6.12)

Period	Pitches
2011 - 2016	65
2016 - 2021	0
2021 - 2026	20
2026 - 2031	0
TOTAL 2011 to 2031	85

The backlog of need identified in the first period are primarily from households resident in South Cambridgeshire on sites that only have temporary planning permission or are on unauthorised sites, and require permanent accommodation.

Future need from population growth fluctuates reflecting the population data. The study notes that beyond the immediate need, assessments of growth are based on modelling, and the best information available. The difficulties in protecting forward beyond 10 years, are noted in national guidance regarding carrying out needs assessments. However, for plan making purposes we need to plan ahead at least 15 years from adoption of the plan. There will be a need to monitor the plan and review it as necessary to take account of more up to date evidence. A further option is that the Council could seek for some of the need to be met outside the district. This approach was found reasonable by the East of England Plan, which determined that some of the need from areas of the highest existing provision like South Cambridgeshire, should be met in surrounding areas with lower levels of existing provision.

The base date for the accommodation needs assessment is January 2011. Since January 2011, 9 pitches have gained planning permission and been completed and occupied. These include a site at Rose and Crown Road, Swavesey which had temporary planning permission but now has permanent planning permission. In addition, a site at Chesterton Fen Road, on land identified for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the Local Plan 2004, is under construction at time of writing. These pitches will contribute to meeting the selected target, therefore reducing the number of pitches needed by 35.

New Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision since January 2011

Address	Number of Pitches	Delivery
Southgate Farm, Chesterton Fen Road, Milton	26	Under Construction
Blackwell Site, Milton	1	Under Construction
Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey	8	Complete
TOTAL NEW PERMANENT PITCHES AFTER JANUARY 2011	35	

On the basis of a target of 85 pitches to 2031 of which 60 need to be provided in the period 2011 to 2016, and a provision so far of 35, sites to provide 25 pitches need to be identified in the Local Plan for the period to 2016, and broad locations identified for the remaining plan period if specific sites cannot be identified.

The two rounds of Issues and Options consultation already undertaken on the Gypsy and Traveller DPD will be used to inform the site allocations to be included in the submission draft Local Plan and so are not subject to further consultation in this Local Plan consultation. In the same way reliance will be placed on the outcome of previous consultations regarding the criteria to be used to guide land supply allocations, the criteria to be taken into account when windfall sites come forward and on the design of new sites.

This plan also needs to address planning issues regarding **Travelling Showpeople** sites. Travelling Showpeople are self-employed business people that, because of their distinctive lifestyle, form a close-knit community with a distinctive culture. A feature of this culture is the importance placed on extended family links often reinforced by family business ties. Sites were often referred to as 'winter quarters', although as the types of employment are changing they may be used at other times of the year. They need secure, permanent bases for the storage of equipment when not in use. Most Showpeople need to live alongside their equipment, so sites must be suitable for both residential and business use.

The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 considered the distinctive needs of this group. There are two existing sites in South Cambridgeshire, both at Meldreth, one site is permitted to accommodate up to 10 plots, and one of up to 11 plots. There are no unauthorised or temporary sites. The Assessment identified a need for 4 plots up to 2016. Given the low numbers involved, the study identified the difficulties in assessing longer-term needs accurately. Reflecting longer term growth rates advocated by the Showman Guild and used in the East of England Plan (1.5% per annum) would indicate a need of 1 to 2 plots per five years period beyond 2016. Evidence of longer term need will be kept under review over the plan period.

	<p>In the previous consultation views were sought on the potential for an additional six plots within the existing Biddles Boulevard site in Meldreth. The outcome of previous consultation will be taken into account in the preparation of the submission draft Local Plan and are not repeated in this consultation.</p> <p>The numbers of plots needed is very low, and over a long period. There is uncertainty over whether this will generate a need for a new site in the district in the longer term, or need could be met on existing sites. It is therefore proposed to rely on additional provision coming forward as windfalls over the period of the plan for the longer term. As for the Gypsy and Traveller pitches, there will be opportunities to review and monitor the plan over the period to see how need develops.</p> <p>Potential for reasonable alternatives</p> <p>i. Four reasonable alternatives have been identified. Set a target to provide 85 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller occupation over the period to 2031, which means we need to provide an additional 30 permanent pitches by 2016, and a total of 50 pitches over the period 2011 to 2031.</p> <p>ii. Either set a target for Travelling Showpeople of 4 plots to 2016 and an additional 3 to 6 plots to 2031, or rely on an additional windfall site coming forward to meet this need over the plan period.</p> <p>iii. Explore with adjoining local planning authorities the extent to which local needs can be met in adjoining districts.</p> <p>iv. Include a policy that requires that site provision be made for Gypsy and Traveller occupation in all new settlements, and other allocated and windfall developments of at least 500 new homes. Any land not needed during the plan period to 2031 to be safeguarded for occupation after the plan period.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 57: What approach should the Local Plan take to the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?</p> <p>Do you agree with any or all of the following approaches?</p> <p>i) Set a target to provide 85 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller occupation over the period to 2031, which means we would need to provide an additional 50 permanent pitches by 2031.</p> <p>ii) Not set a target for Travelling Showpeople occupation and rely on an additional windfall site coming forward over the plan period.</p> <p>iii) Explore with adjoining local planning authorities the extent to which local needs can be met in adjoining districts.</p> <p>iv) The Local Plan require that site provision be made for Gypsy</p>

	and Traveller occupation in all new settlements, and other allocated and windfall developments of at least 500 new homes.
--	---

Issue 58	Dwellings to Support a Rural Based Enterprise
Key evidence	None
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Control Policies DPD: Dwelling to Support a Rural Based Enterprise (HG/9)
Analysis	<p>National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 55) states that, ‘Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;...’ <p>Potential for reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>The Local Plan could:</p> <p>i. Include a policy which sets out the circumstances in which it will be acceptable to build a new home for an employee of a rural based enterprise to help support successful rural businesses and retain a living countryside. The policy would be consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), but add additional details concerning such matters as the evidence that would be required from the applicant, any restrictions to be placed on the occupation of such dwellings and when they might be relaxed and that dwellings associated with the keeping of horses would not be appropriate.</p> <p>ii. Not include such a policy in the plan and rely on the policy in the NPPF.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 58: How should the Local Plan address the needs of dwellings to support rural enterprises?</p> <p>i) Include a policy which sets out the circumstances in which it will be acceptable to build a new home for an employee of a rural based enterprise.</p> <p>ii) Not include such a policy and rely upon the policy guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>

10. Economy

Issue 59	New Employment Provision near Cambridge
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Employment Land Review Update 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2010
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy: ST/8 Employment Provision
Analysis	<p>The Local Plan needs to plan for the needs of the economy, establishing the level of need, and how it will be accommodated over the plan period. The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 22) states, 'To help achieve economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century.'</p> <p>In order to identify the level of need for different sectors, the Council commissioned an Employment Land Review in 2012, to update the review completed in 2008.</p> <p>The land review explores jobs growth forecast, particularly focusing on the forecast commissioned from Cambridge Econometrics that have been utilised when developing development strategy options. The forecasts identify the changes anticipated in 40 different sectors of the economy. It then models the floorspace and land requirements of different land use classes that would be required to accommodate the jobs growth. A particular difference in the 2012 Employment Land Review was the assumptions regarding employment densities, which have been updated to reflect national guidance, and local evidence.</p> <p>The Land Review identified an overall need for between 22 and 59 hectares of new employment land, depending on the growth scenario utilised. The Local Plan needs to plan to meet the anticipated needs to achieve economic growth.</p> <p>The Annual Monitoring Report identifies that at April 2011 there was exiting employment Land supply with planning permission totalling over 78 hectares, with floorspace capacity of around 160,000m². However this includes a large grain storage development at Camgrain near Balsham (use class B8) comprising 25 hectares, and 10 hectares manufacturing at a carbon fibre precursor plant off Hinxton Road, south of Duxford (B2). Offices and Research and development account for around 90,000m² of the total. In 2012 planning permission was granted for further development at Granta Park, and Cambridge Research Park, totalling just over 20 hectares of offices and research and development.</p> <p>On the face of it this may seem sufficient supply, however, not all sites are equally attractive to new employers. The ELR identified a particular need for office space in or on the edge of Cambridge floorspace for sites in or on the edge of Cambridge. There is also a need to consider sustainability, and how provision of new employment at part major developments can help make places, and give people the opportunity to live where they work.</p>

	<p>There are existing Strategic Employment locations, identified in the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan, and the Northstowe Area Action Plan, that will deliver significant new employment provision in the plan period, or even beyond.</p> <p>The ELR looks at how much employment land is available and whether there is sufficient land of the right quality in the right places to support the economy. The evidence suggests a shortage of office space, particularly focused on two areas of pressure: the city centre, and the northern fringe around Cambridge Science Park. To continue the success of the economy more office space is needed in these areas. There are two areas in South Cambridgeshire where more employment development is possible to address this issue.</p> <p>Cambridge Northern Fringe East, where a new railway station and transport interchange is planned, will provide opportunities for further employment development. Options for this area are explored in greater detail in the Site Specific Policies chapter.</p> <p>Cambridge Science Park on the northern edge of Cambridge lies within South Cambridgeshire. Some of the early phases were built at low densities and are forty years old, and there is scope for intensification or even redevelopment. The increased accessibility provided by the guided bus and the new railway station means that higher employment densities are suitable and capable of being achieved.</p> <p>A further possibility would be to allocate new land for employment on the edge of Cambridge. This could be purely employment, or as part of a housing development. The Strategy chapter explores the potential for growth through Green Belt review on the edge of Cambridge, and identifies and assesses 10 broad locations.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Densification on Cambridge Science Park • Employment Development at Cambridge Northern Fringe East. • Green Belt review, through options identified in the strategy chapter. • Do not identify any of the above options.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 59: The Local Plan needs to aim to meet in full the forecast employment growth in South Cambridgeshire depending on the option selected (at question 3), by providing a supply and range of employment sites over the Plan period.</p> <p>Should employment provision be planned for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Cambridge Northern Fringe East, and densification on the Cambridge Science Park? ii. On new allocations on the edge of Cambridge which have previously been designated Green Belt (See identified broad locations in Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy) iii. Both Option i and Option ii

	iv. Neither Option i or Option ii
--	-----------------------------------

Issue 60	Employment Allocations
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Employment Land Review Update 2012 • South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Employment Land Review 2008
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Specific Policies DPD: SP/12 Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses; SP/13 Allocations for Class B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses
Analysis	<p>There are a number of employment land allocations in the Local Development Framework Site Specific Policies DPD. The Local Plan review needs to consider existing allocations and whether any warrant continued inclusion in the new plan.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 22) states, ‘Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.’</p> <p>The following section reviews each of the sites:</p> <p>SP/12 Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses</p> <p>a. Longstanton: N of Hattons Road up to the proposed bypass (6.7 hectares) allocated for 12,500 m2 of gross internal floor area of Research & Development use.</p> <p>The allocation was originally made in the Local Plan 1993, alongside a residential development of 510 dwellings, in conjunction with the Longstanton Bypass. Over half the dwellings are now complete. Outline and reserve matter planning permission was granted for the employment development, but these consents have now lapsed, and the development has not commenced.</p> <p>The site has been submitted through the call for sites for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p> <p>b. Pampisford: West of Eastern Counties Leather, London Road (residue) (1.9 hectares)</p> <p>The remaining area forms the residue of a site allocated in the 1993 Local Plan. Around, 0.4 hectares of the original allocation has been developed, with outline planning permission granted on a further 1.1 hectares of the site. The remaining area is located to the rear of</p>

	<p>employment site, and does not warrant consideration for alternative uses.</p> <p>c. The former Bayer Crop Science site at Hauxton as part of a mixed-use redevelopment.</p> <p>The site was allocated in the Site Specific Policies DPD, and has subsequently been granted outline planning permission for mixed use development.</p> <p>SP/13 Allocations for Class B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses</p> <p>a. Over: Norman Way (residue)</p> <p>The site comprises 1.7 hectares to the rear of the existing business park. The site has outline planning permission (S/1595/03) and a reserved matters planning application (S/2294/06) is pending. It represents the final parcel of the planned business park, and does not warrant consideration for alternative uses.</p> <p>b. Papworth Everard: Ermine Street South (residue)</p> <p>The majority of the site has now been completed. Full planning permission (S/0633/07) for the remaining parcel of land at the north-eastern end of the site was granted, but has now lapsed. The final parcel at the back of the business park does not warrant consideration for alternative uses, and remains a logical development area for completion of the business park.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>Allocations at Over, Papworth Everard and Pampisford represent remaining parcels of existing business parks, and the residue of previous plan allocations where partial development has already taken place. Alternative approaches are to continue to allocate in the Development Plan, or to remove the allocation. Papworth Everard and Pampisford remains in the current Development Framework, and the area at Over falls within an Established Employment Area in the Countryside. If the allocations are not maintained proposals for development could be considered under those policies.</p> <p>The employment allocation at Longstanton has been put forward as an option for housing through the SHLAA, but has not been identified as a reasonable option for residential development. Alternative approaches for employment allocation are to continue the allocation, or do not carry forward.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 60:</p> <p>A: Should the existing employment allocations where development is partially complete be carried forward into the Local Plan?</p> <p>B: Should the existing employment allocation North of Hattons Road, Longstanton be carried forward into the Local Plan?</p> <p>C: Are there any other areas that should be allocated in the Local Plan</p>

	for employment?
--	-----------------

Issue 61	Local Development Orders
Key evidence	
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>The UK government has put growth of the economy at the top of its list of national priorities. In the UK almost all employment development needs planning permission and local authorities are being urged to do everything possible to speed up this process.</p> <p>A Local Development Order is a new type of planning mechanism, which enables council's to speed up the application process and make it easier for development to take place. A Local Development Order would identify certain types and scales of development that could take place without the need for planning permission within a defined area, such as a business park or planned development site. A Local Development Order is like a planning permission and can include a number of conditions, just like a planning permission, with which developments must comply and would have the same requirements for the development to pay for any necessary infrastructure as if a planning application was made.</p> <p>Although outside the plan making process, the Council could consider issuing LDOs to support economic development.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Council is using the consultation to gather views regarding whether it should issue LDOs.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 61: A: Should the Council consider issuing Local Development Orders to help speed up employment development? B: If so, where?</p>

Issue 62	Limitations on the occupancy of New Premises in South Cambridgeshire
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment Land Review Update 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2010 • Cambridge Cluster at 50
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: ET/1 Limitations on the occupancy of New Premises in South Cambridgeshire; ET/5 Development for the Expansion of Firms
Analysis	<p>Successive plans for the Cambridge Area have included policy for the selective management of economic development, to encourage high tech and related industries; small-scale industries making use of local skills and office development only that is essential to the Cambridge area.</p> <p>The aim has been to reserve land for uses that can demonstrate a need for a Cambridge location, reflecting the high development pressures in the area, and in order to manage growth to protect the very qualities that</p>

	<p>attract firms to the area in the first place.</p> <p>Uses such as large scale warehousing, and office uses that could equally locate anywhere in the country, would not comply with the policy.</p> <p>In order to implement this policy, plans have imposed limitations on the occupancy of new premises, to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offices providing an essential service for Cambridge as a local or Sub-Regional Centre; • High technology and related industries and services, and educational uses primarily concerned with research and development which can show a need to be located close to the University and other established research facilities close to Cambridge; • Other small scale industries which contribute to providing a greater range of employment opportunities (up to 1850 m2 for a single user). <p>Future occupation of buildings is controlled for 10 years from the date of first occupation.</p> <p>There are exceptions for expansion of existing firms. An existing firm is defined as a firm or business will be considered as 'existing' if a significant element of its operation has been based in the Cambridge Area for a minimum of five years prior to the date of any planning application for development and within that time has maintained a viable business operation locally.</p> <p>The 'Cambridge Cluster at 50 – The Cambridge Economy – retrospective and prospective (EEDA and Partners 2011)' identifies that the high-tech cluster is 'maturing', and anticipates growth in the high tech economy will be slower than in the past, and other sectors will account for a higher proportion of growth. It states that Cambridge may not have been making the best use of its knowledge based assets, and some rebalancing towards outward looking high-tech and knowledge based activity (such as high value manufacturing, and headquarters functions). Consultations leading to the Council's Economic development strategy highlighted that some businesses and stakeholders perceived planning policies to be insufficiently flexible (for change of use, extensions and new premises), and that the policy was a particular problem for small and medium sized businesses.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review 2012 has explored alternative options for the policy. The local economy in the last few decades has been a success story, and it difficult to ascertain whether this was as a result of the policy or despite it. Nevertheless the review identifies a number of potential disadvantages of the policy moving forward, including exacerbating a shortage of general offices, and holding back high value manufacturing.</p> <p>The Local Plan review will need to consider whether the selective management of employment policies remain appropriate given the changing circumstances. As well as its retention or removal, the Local Plan should consider whether amendments can be made, to seek the</p>
--	---

	<p>best mix of policy benefits and costs.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Alternatives to keep or remove the policy, or to keep or amend parts of the policy.</p> <p>The review of the Local Plan should consider whether selective management of the economy as a policy approach should be continued, amended, or discontinued.</p> <p>Continuation of the policy could maintain a prioritisation of land for firms that can demonstrate a need to be here. This policy is a long running feature of planning policy for the area and it could be argued it has contributed to current economic success, and priorities land for uses that support the Cambridge clusters. However it also holds certain types of employment development back.</p> <p>Maintaining the policy on selected high technology business parks could continue to protect specific areas for research and development uses, whilst providing greater flexibility elsewhere.</p> <p>Amending the policy to additionally allow high value manufacturing and high tech headquarters could further support Cambridge's high technology research and development clusters, by encouraging them to further develop ideas into products and to bring high value jobs to the area.</p> <p>Maintaining a restriction on large scale warehousing and distribution, would mean new uses requiring a large land area but that do not need a Cambridge area location would not be permitted.</p> <p>Removing the restrictions entirely would allow the market to decide the type of employment use in new premises. This risks greater competition for land for uses such as research and development or lower value uses that need to locate here, but it could also allow other sectors to develop</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 62: What approach do you think the Local Plan should take to the Limitations on the Occupancy of New Premises policy?:</p> <p>i. Retain the current policy approach to encourage high tech research and development but offices, light industry and warehousing being small scale local provision only.</p> <p>ii. Retain the policy in its current form for specified areas: Cambridge Science Park Granta Park Babraham Institute Wellcome Trust Melbourn Science Park North West Cambridge (University)</p> <p>iii. Amend the policy to allow for large scale, high value manufacturing and high tech headquarters to locate to South Cambridgeshire.</p>

	<p>iv. Remove the policy apart from the restriction on large-scale warehousing and distribution.</p> <p>v. Remove the policy entirely.</p>
--	--

Issue 63	Promotion of Clusters
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Employment Land Review Update 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2010 • Cambridge Cluster at 50 Study
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: ET/2 Promotion of Clusters
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries. The Council's Economic Development Strategy identified a particular need for premises to support start-ups and enterprise, and low cost lab/office space.</p> <p>Current policy sets out the clusters that are fundamental to the success of the Cambridge Phenomenon and positively promotes development that can demonstrate a clear need to cluster in the Cambridge area. The policy also supports the development of a range of units, including incubator units.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could continue a policy to support clusters. Alternative would be to not have a policy, but this would not comply with the NPPF, or respond to evidence in the Economic Development Strategy.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 63: Should the plan continue to include a policy supporting the development of clusters?

Issue 64	Shared social spaces as part of employment areas
Key evidence	<p>South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Employment Land Review Update 2012</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2010</p> <p>Cambridge Cluster at 50 Study</p>
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>The Cambridge Cluster at 50 study identifies the fact that a number of peripheral employment sites are perceived to be isolated, both in relation to each other and in relation to Cambridge City Centre. The lack of a social aspect, is making them less attractive places to locate to. The study notes that this could simply be a function of time.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Pan could include a policy to promote shared social spaces on employment parks, such as cafes, restaurants, or social hubs, or not</p>

	include a policy.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 64: Should the Local plan seek shared social spaces on or near employment parks?

Issue 65	Broadband
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2010 • Cambridge Cluster at 50 Study
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>The Council's Economic Development Strategy highlighted uneven delivery of broadband across the district as an issue affecting business competitiveness and economic productivity in the district. Provision of quality broadband is particularly important for rural areas, for community integration to help ensure a vibrant rural economy and assist with farm diversification and for home working. The Strategy includes the objective to improve utilities and infrastructure (e.g. Broadband and ICT) in the District for residents and employers, including those located in the new communities and rural locations. The Northstowe Area Action Plan seeks broadband provision for the new town but currently the same approach is not applied across the rural parts of the district.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>The Plan could require provision for broadband (such as ducting for cables) should be designed and installed as an integral part of development, which minimises visual impact and future disturbance during maintenance. All telecommunications infrastructure should be capable of responding to changes in technology requirements over the period of the development.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 65: Do you think that the Local Plan should include a policy seeking provision for broadband infrastructure in new developments?

Issue 66	Established Employment Areas in the Countryside
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment Land Review Update 2012
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: ET/3 Development in Established Employment Areas in the Countryside
Analysis	<p>South Cambridgeshire includes a number of existing rural business parks. Policies generally restrict development in the countryside. However, these major employment parks do not form a typical part of the countryside. In order to enable more efficient use of these sites and enable them to be adapted over time for the needs of current and future users, the current plan establishes the criteria for considering planning applications in these areas.</p> <p>The policy defines a specific set of 12 established employment areas in the countryside, focusing on major business parks, of significant scale, primarily with multiple units and firms, located outside the green belt. It</p>

	<p>does not identify small sites, such as those developed through conversion or replacement of former agricultural buildings. It also does not identify sites in the Green Belt, as these are covered by other policies regarding appropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The following sites have previously been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buckingway Business Park • Cambourne Business Park • Cambridge Research Park, Landbeach • Site to North of Cambridge Research Park, Landbeach • Granta Park, Great Abington • Wellcome Trust Genome Campus, Hinxton • Norman Way Industrial Estate, Over • Land at Hinxton Road, South of Duxford • Convent Drive / Pembroke Avenue site, Waterbeach • Brookfields Business Estate / Park, Twentypence Road, Cottenham • Spicers Ltd, Sawston • Daleshead Foods Ltd, Cambridge Road, Linton. <p>The policy does not allocate land for development. It permits development and redevelopment for employment use, subject to other policies in the development plan, including consideration of employment land supply.</p> <p>Two additional potential sites have been identified. Both are around 10 hectares, and provide areas of significant existing employment development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eternit UK site between Meldreth and Whaddon; • Barrington Cement Works (area of existing buildings) <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The local plan could continue to identify sites, and include a policy enabling appropriate employment development within these areas.</p> <p>A review of sites has identified two additional potential sites.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 66: A: Should development within established employment areas in the countryside be allowed?</p> <p>B: Should additional areas (both around 10 hectares), be included at –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Eternit UK site between Meldreth and Whaddon; ii. Barrington Cement Works (area of existing and former buildings)

Issue 67	New Employment Development in Villages
Key evidence	
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: ET/4 New Employment Development in Villages

Analysis	<p>Enabling new employment development of an appropriate scale in villages can help provide local employment opportunities, support the development of local firms, and reduce the need for development of new greenfield sites. It can also enhance the vitality of villages, and reduce the need to travel to access employment opportunities.</p> <p>Existing policy enables small scale employment development within village frameworks, and on previously developed sites adjoining or very close to the village frameworks of Rural Centres or Minor Rural Centres. Small scale is defined as employing no more than 25 people, and floorspace figures reflecting this for different uses classes are included in the policy.</p> <p>Whilst this ensures that development remains small scale, it does not allow for a situation where a larger scale may be appropriate to the circumstances of the village and a particular site. An alternative policy could be less specific, but seek for the scale of development to be in keeping with the scale, character and function of the settlement.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: It would not be reasonable to not include a policy that supports appropriately scaled employment development within villages, as it would not support delivery of local jobs and the maintain the viability of village communities. The Local Plan could continue to identify a scale of development, or include a more flexible criteria based approach.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 67: What approach should the Local Plan take to the scale of employment development in villages?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Continue to restrict to small scale development (employing 25 people) and the size limitations: Offices (B1a): 400 m², High tech / R & D (B1b): 725 m², Light Industry (B1c):800sq m², General Industry (B2):850 m², Warehousing (B8):1,250 m²). ii. A more flexible approach that development should be in keeping with the category, character, function and of the settlement.

Issue 68	New employment buildings on the edge of settlements
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: ET/4 New Employment Development in Villages
Analysis	<p>The Councils current plan includes flexibility to utilise previously developed land adjoining or very close to the larger villages in the district for small scale employment uses. This enables best use to be made of previously developed land within walking distance of villages, whilst restricting new development in the wider countryside.</p> <p>A more flexible approach could be to allow development of any land adjoining the village frameworks of any villages. This could benefit the local economy, but could also impact on the rural character of the edges of settlements and could be exploited to secure inappropriate housing</p>

	<p>development on the footing that there was no demand for employment.</p> <p>Other considerations will include accessibility of the site, particularly for walking, cycling or public transport, and that it would not have an adverse impact of the character of the area. These will be addressed by other policies in the plan.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Alternatives centre around re-use of previously developed land adjoining or very close to the village frameworks, or whether additional flexibility should be added to utilise Greenfield land adjoining frameworks of better served villages.</p> <p>A further alternative would be to seek for applicants to demonstrate there are no existing buildings and sites in the village.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 68: A: What approach should the Local Plan take to employment development on the edges of villages?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Flexibility to utilise previously developed land adjoining or very close to the village frameworks of any villages. ii. Flexibility to utilise green-field land <u>adjoining</u>, and logically related to the built form of the settlement of Rural, Minor Rural Centres [and Better Served Group villages if added as a new category of village – see question 13]. <p>B: Should applicants be required to demonstrate there is a lack of suitable buildings and sites within the settlement?</p>

Issue 69	Extensions to existing businesses in the countryside
Key evidence	
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>There are many existing firms in the rural areas of South Cambridgeshire. In order to support the continued development of their business, they may need to adapt or expand to their premises. Policies are generally restrictive towards new development in the countryside, but the plan could consider how to support these existing firms.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could continue to apply a generally restrictive approach to development in the countryside, and proposals would have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances, or it could support the appropriate expansion of existing firms in the countryside</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 69: What approach should be taken to extension of existing businesses in the countryside?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. continue to apply a generally restrictive approach, where proposals would have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances;

	<p>or</p> <p>ii. support expansion of existing firms where schemes are of an appropriate scale, do not have an adverse effect in terms of character and amenity, and can be justified through submission of a business case.</p>
--	--

Issue 70	Conversion or Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment
Key evidence	
Existing policies	<p>Development Control Policies DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ET/7 Conversion of Rural Buildings for Employment • ET/8 Replacement Buildings in the Countryside
Analysis	<p>Rural buildings have provided many opportunities for conversion for employment uses in the district, and provide a way of supporting the rural economy and making best use of an existing resource.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 28) states that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. Plans should support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings, and promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses.</p> <p>NPPF (paragraph 55) states that Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as: where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting</p> <p>Existing policy enables the conversion of rural buildings in the countryside for employment use, subject to them being suitable for conversion. Replacement buildings are permitted where it would bring about environmental improvement or result in a more sustainable development.</p> <p>Proposals would need to be compatible with other policies in the plan, including those minimising the need to travel by ensuring developments generating significant numbers of trips are in locations where there is access by means other than the car.</p> <p>Existing policy requires that scale is not significantly increased in order to protect the character of the countryside. Increases in floor area are strictly controlled and only for the benefit of the design.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Alternatives whether the council should continue to priorities employment, and how any proposals for extension should be addressed.</p>
Final Issues and	Question 70:

Options Approaches	<p>A: Should the Local Plan should continue to prioritise employment uses for rural buildings where traffic generation is not a problem?</p> <p>B: Should the Local Plan support extensions where they enhance the design and are not out of scale and character with the location.</p>
--------------------	---

Issue 71	Farm Diversification
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: ET/9 Farm Diversification
Analysis	<p>Farming makes an important contribution to the South Cambridgeshire economy, but increasingly farms are having to diversify into non-agricultural activities, for the business to remain viable. This could include planting of woodland, farm shops, farm-based food processing and packaging, craft workshops, sporting facilities, fishing lakes, equestrian businesses, nature trails or holiday accommodation.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 28) states that Plans should support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings, and promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses.</p> <p>It is important that diversification proposals are well founded in terms of effectively contributing to the farm business and the rural economy and integrating new activities into the environment and the rural scene.</p> <p>Existing policy requires proposals to be in scale with their location, utilise existing buildings where possible, and that any new buildings are located as part of an existing group of buildings. They also require submission of a farm plan to demonstrate how the proposal would support a working farm.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could continue to support farm diversification, where schemes directly support a working farm, are in scale with their location, reuse existing buildings where possible, and any new development forms part of an existing group of buildings.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 71: Do you agree that the Local Plan should continue to support farm diversification?

Issue 72	Retention of Employment Sites
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Monitoring Report
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: ET/6 Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses

Analysis	<p>Employment land and buildings in villages are a limited resource. Maintaining employment in villages provides local employment opportunities, reducing the need to travel, and providing opportunities for the less mobile. Maintaining a mix of units also supports the vitality and viability of local communities. It can also help ensure that employment needs are met by helping to maintain the range of premises available. The premature loss of sites could harm local firms, and increase pressure for new greenfield development. Whilst protecting sites, policy must also allow some flexibility to take account of sites that may no longer be suitable or appropriate for employment use.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (Chapter 18 Economic Activity) highlights that the ratio of jobs to people of economically active age varies greatly, but in the majority of wards the ratio is less than 1, meaning local people have little choice but to travel to access employment opportunities. Over the last 12 years, 43.53 ha of employment land in the district has been lost to other uses, of this 81% has been lost to residential development (Annual Monitoring Report 2011). Existing planning policies seek to protect employment land in villages from loss to alternative uses. Despite this, monitoring shows there has continued to be a gradual loss averaging 1.6 hectares per year.</p> <p>Existing Development Control Policies DPD policy protects employment land in villages from change of use to non-employment uses unless certain criteria are met. These criteria relate to a site being demonstrated as inappropriate for continued employment use (demonstrated by evidence of it being appropriately marketed for at least 12 months), overall community benefit outweighing the loss, or the existing use generating environmental problems (and alternative employment use would continue to generate problems).</p> <p>Following views that the tests are not sufficient to adequately protect employment land, alternative tests have been identified for consultation.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Maintain the policy or do not carry it forward. Alternative tests have also been identified to consider when an alternative use may be appropriate.</p> <p>A variation on the policy approach would be to widen the policy to consider sites adjoining or near to village frameworks as well as within frameworks, as there are employment sites near to frameworks which equally contribute to the overall sustainability of villages.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 72:</p> <p>A: Should the Local Plan continue to resist the loss of employment land to alternative uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. in villages only ii. include areas outside frameworks on the edges of villages. <p>B: Should the Local Plan include the alternative more detailed tests in Issue 72 for determining when alternative use of an employment site</p>

	should be permitted?
--	----------------------

Issue 73	Tourist Accommodation
Key evidence	Cambridge Hotel Futures Study (Cambridge City Council 2012) Cambridge Cluster at 50
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: ET/10 Tourist Facilities and Visitor Accommodation
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 28) states that Plans should support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside. This should include supporting the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres.</p> <p>Tourism development, including Hotels, is identified by the National Planning Policy Framework as a main town centre use, and therefore a sequential approach should be applied to facilities other than small scale rural development. In terms of Hotel accommodation Cambridge City Council commissioned a study, Cambridge Hotel Futures Study (Cambridge City Council 2012). Options are reflected in their Local Plan issues and Options Report, and identify an additional need only with the highest need scenario.</p> <p>Reflecting this evidence, is not considered necessary to specifically allocate land for further hotel development in South Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>However, the plan needs to address proposals for small scale rural development which can support the local tourism industry and provide local employment.</p> <p>It is important that tourist accommodation development takes place in a sustainable manner, and in particular conserves the character of the countryside and reduces the need for car-borne journeys. Directing most development to existing settlements, and controlling the scale of development in the countryside can help to achieve these ends.</p> <p>Existing policies support proposals for the construction, extension or conversion to overnight visitor accommodation, holiday accommodation, public houses and restaurants, within the defined village frameworks, subject to proposals being in scale with their rural location. Outside development frameworks, change of use or conversion, replacement of existing buildings, or appropriately modest extensions to existing facilities for overnight visitor accommodation, holiday accommodation, public houses and restaurants is also supported.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Maintain the existing policy, or an alternative more flexible approach could be to provide greater flexibility, and permit the use of previously developed land in the countryside for small scaled holiday accommodation. This would need to be subject to other policy</p>

	considerations, in particular sustainable transport.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 73:</p> <p>A: Should appropriately scaled development for visitor and holiday accommodation in villages, and the conversion or redevelopment of rural buildings in the countryside be supported?</p> <p>B: Should the Local Plan provide greater flexibility for new visitor accommodation by allowing redevelopment of any previously developed land in the countryside for small scale holiday and visitor accommodation?</p>

Issue 74	Tourist facilities and visitor attractions
Key evidence	
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Control Policies DPD: ET/10 Tourist Facilities and Visitor Accommodation
Analysis	<p>The plan needs to consider how proposals for tourist facilities and visitor attractions will be considered.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (Chapter 18 Economic Activity) highlights that According to ONS 3,600 people were employed in the tourism industry in 2009. Important tourism attractions within the district include Duxford Imperial War Museum, Wimpole Hall, the American Military Cemetery at Madingley, Chilford Hall and Linton Zoo. Cambridge City is a popular place for people to visit and South Cambs benefits from being so close because tourists will either stay in this district to visit the City or have days out into the countryside from the City.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 28) states that Plans should support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside. This should include supporting the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres.</p> <p>Tourism development, including theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels and conference facilities, is identified by the National Planning Policy Framework as a main town centre use, and therefore a sequential approach should be applied to facilities other than those supporting sustainable rural tourism (addressed in paragraph 28).</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>The Local Plan does not currently include a policy supporting tourism facilities development. An alternative approach would be to include a policy that new development or expansion of existing tourist facilities and visitor attractions in the countryside could be permitted where the need for a rural location has been demonstrated, and the use cannot be located elsewhere. The need for new buildings should be demonstrated, including evidence that opportunities for reuse or replacement of existing buildings have been explored. Proposals must also not detrimentally impact on landscape, be in scale with the location, and provide</p>

	appropriate transport accessibility, including by sustainable modes.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 74:</p> <p>A: Should the Local Plan contain a policy supporting the development of appropriate tourist facilities and visitor attractions?</p> <p>B: Could these be located in the countryside?</p>

Issue 75	Retail Hierarchy
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Sub-Regional Retail Study 2008 • North West Cambridge Supplementary Retail Study 2010 • South Cambridgeshire Settlement Hierarchy Review 2012
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD: Retail Hierarchy ST/9 • Development Control Policies DPD: Applications for new retail development SF/2
Analysis	<p>The Local Plan must ensure that retail proposals are of an appropriate scale for the location, and in particular the position of the centre of location in the retail hierarchy.</p> <p>Policy is needed to ensure a sequential approach to main town centre uses is applied, and major retail development needs are focused on town centres, reflecting the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 24).</p> <p>Paragraph 25 of the NPPF requires that ‘This sequential approach should not be applied to applications for small scale rural offices or other small scale rural development.’ This is reflected in policies regarding retailing in village shops.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire is unusual in that primary retail centres are located outside the district, in the City of Cambridge, and the ring of Market Towns surrounding the district.</p> <p>The new town of Northstowe will have a new town centre. The Northstowe Area Action Plan requires that the town centre will make provision for such a range of shops, services, cultural, leisure, entertainment and community facilities that will serve the needs of Northstowe and the immediately surrounding area without undermining the vitality and viability of nearby village centres and market towns or compete with Cambridge.</p> <p>Village centres at Rural Centres and other villages fulfil the role of local centres, providing a small rural hinterland with local shopping facilities. These out of town locations are not a suitable location for uses that serve wider urban areas that would be subject to the sequential test.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>The hierarchy of centres in South Cambridgeshire is proposed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Northstowe town centre; b. Rural Centres village centres;

	<p>c. Other villages</p> <p>The proposed hierarchy reflects the nature of settlements in the district.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 75: Where should new retail and service provision occur?</p> <p>i. New retail provision and main town centre uses should be in scale with the position of the centre in the retail hierarchy as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Town centres: Northstowe; b. Rural Centres village centres; c. All other villages. <p>ii. New facilities should be provided differently – if so, how?</p>

Issue 76	Assessing the Impact of Retail Development
Key evidence	Cambridge Sub-Regional Retail Study 2008 North West Cambridge Supplementary Retail Study 2010
Existing policies	Applications for new retail development (DCDPD SF/2)
Analysis	<p>Paragraph 26 of the NPPF requires an impact assessment for proposals outside town centres which are not in accordance with the Local Plan. It requires that Local Plans include a locally set floor space threshold for requiring an impact assessment. It sets a national default threshold of 2500m².</p> <p>Given the rural nature of the district, currently only the largest superstores in the district and surrounding area (for figures see Cambridge Sub-Region Retail Study table 8.1, and Review of Settlement Hierarchy) would breach this threshold, but smaller scale of development could still have a significant impact on the vitality and viability of village services in the district. It is therefore important that the plan considers a lower threshold.</p> <p>Reflecting the NPPF the plan needs to support retention and development of local services such as local shops (paragraph 28). It therefore needs to support this type of development, whilst ensuring that larger scales of development that would potentially have wider impacts on other centres are appropriately assessed. It is important to note that requiring an assessment does not rule out development, particularly if it complies with other policies in the plan.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>Alternatives regarding the threshold for retail impact assessment. In all cases gross floorspace figures are used.</p> <p>a) 2500m². The default scale set by the National Planning Policy Framework. Only large superstore proposals would be assessed.</p> <p>b) 500m² – The size of the larger central village supermarkets in the Rural Centres. Setting this threshold would enable village scale supermarkets to be developed without a retail assessment, but there</p>

	<p>could be less consideration of cumulative impact than setting a lower threshold.</p> <p>c) 250m² – Reflects the scale of a more typical village shop. Using this threshold would enable continued development of small shops, but larger stores would require an assessment. This could mean additional information required from applicants, but it would enable greater consideration of cumulative impact.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 76: What should be the floorspace threshold above which retail impact assessments are required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 2500m² - large superstore ii. 500m² - village scale supermarket iii. 250m² - typical village shop

Issue 77	Meeting Retail Needs
Key evidence	North West Cambridge Supplementary Retail Study 2010
Existing policies	Informal planning policy guidance for North West Cambridge
Analysis	<p>A Supplementary Retail Study commissioned in 2010 to examine the specific retail needs of the northwest Cambridge area. This is because a number of sites were being planned in the same area, and there was a need to consider how their shopping needs could best be accommodated. It led to the adoption of Informal Planning Policy Guidance on foodstore provision in North West Cambridge. This sets out a strategy for two medium sized supermarkets of 2,000 sq.m net floorspace, one in the local centre at the University site and one in the local centre at the NIAB site, and one small supermarket in the local centre at Orchard Park. The informal policy guidance also sets out a number of development principles in relation to the development of foodstores and local centres, which should be followed by developers.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could include a policy reflecting the Informal Policy Guidance.</p> <p>The policy guidance was prepared following a retail study, consideration of options, and public consultation. It is therefore proposed as the only option.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 77: Should the Informal Planning Policy Guidance on foodstore provision in North West Cambridge should be reflected in the new Local Plan?

Issue 78	Village Shops and Related Local Services
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Sub-Regional Retail Study 2008

Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Control Policies DPD: Retailing in Villages (SF/4)
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 70) requires planning policies to plan positively for provision of local services to enhance the sustainability of local communities and residential environments.</p> <p>The importance of retaining local services and facilities was highlighted in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, particularly in relation to inclusive communities, and the issues caused by rurality. Supporting local retail facilities can aid access to services, particularly in rural communities where alternatives to the car are often limited.</p> <p>The Local Plan needs to include a policy to support retail proposals in villages where the size and attraction of the shopping development is of an appropriate scale to the function of the village.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: There are no reasonable alternatives to supporting development of village shops of an appropriate scale, in order to support the vitality and viability of existing communities.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 78: Do you think that the Local Plan should support development of new or improved village shops and local services of an appropriate size related to the scale and function of the village?</p>

Issue 79	Retailing in the Countryside
Key evidence	Cambridge Sub-Regional Retail Study 2008
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Retailing in the Countryside (SF/5)
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework requires policies to support the vitality and viability of town centres. They should define a network of centres, and apply a sequential test to retail development. The sequential test should not be applied to small scale rural development.</p> <p>Sporadic development in the countryside could result in unsustainable patterns of development, and harm the vitality and viability of villages. Policies regarding village frameworks also generally resist development outside frameworks, apart from uses that need to be located in the countryside.</p> <p>Policy is needed to support uses that need to be located in the countryside.</p> <p>This includes sales from farms and nurseries of produce and craft goods, where the majority of goods are produced on the farm or in the locality supports farm diversification and local businesses.</p> <p>There may also be cases where sales of convenience goods ancillary to other uses is appropriate, for example at a garage. In such cases, it will be necessary to consider the impact on viability of surrounding villages.</p>

	<p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: None.</p> <p>Existing policy requires that in the countryside, retail development should not be permitted, other than sales from farms and nurseries of produce and craft goods, where the majority of goods are produced on the farm or in the locality, or sale of convenience goods ancillary to other uses, where it does not have a significant adverse impact on surrounding villages.</p> <p>An alternative would be to permit other facilities, and the consultation provides an opportunity for feedback on what they might be.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 79: Do you think that retail development in the countryside should be restricted?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. As described. ii. To include additional facilities.

11. Promoting Successful Communities

Issue 80	Health Impact Assessment
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Health Impact Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (2011)
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: DP/1 Sustainable Development
Analysis	<p>Spatial planning and development has the potential to impact on human health and wellbeing. This is because a wide range of social and environmental factors affect the health of local communities within South Cambridgeshire. Good health is related to good quality housing and developments, well designed street scenes, well laid out neighbourhoods, quality and efficiency in transport systems, opportunities to experience leisure and cultural services activities and green and open space. Ensuring these issues are considered at the planning and design stage can improve both the physical and mental health of the population.</p> <p>Health Impact Assessments (HIA) are designed to check whether a proposal might reinforce health inequalities, or inadvertently damage people's health in its widest sense. Health impact Assessment is a process recommended by the World Health Organisation, and the Department of Health</p> <p>Existing policy requires assessments to be submitted alongside proposals for major developments (above 20 dwellings or 1000m² of commercial development) to provide an assessment, tailored to the scale and nature of the development.</p> <p>HIA is most effective on major developments. An issue for the plan to consider is whether the threshold should be raised. This could reduce the burden on developers of smaller schemes, whilst health impact could still be addressed through sustainability, and design and access statements.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: To ensure that new developments have a positive impact on the health and well-being of new and existing residents, the Local Plan could continue to require Health Impact Assessments (HIA) of major development proposals. However, HIA is most effective on large scale developments, and smaller developments can be sufficiently addressed in sustainability and design and access statements. An option for the Local Plan could be to include a higher threshold when an HIA is required.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 80:</p> <p>A: Should the Local Plan continue to seek Health Impact Assessments (HIA) to accompany major development proposals?</p> <p>B: Should the threshold when HIA are required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Remain at 20 or more dwellings or 1,000m² floorspace; or Be raised to 100 or more dwellings, or 5,000m² floorspace.

Issue 81	Protection of Village Services and Facilities
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Services and Facilities Study 2012
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Control Policies DPD: SF/1 Protection of village services and facilities
Analysis	<p>One of the Council's corporate aims is to play our part in improving rural services.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 70) states that planning policies should 'guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs.'</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report identified that many villages, particularly smaller villages, have a limited range of services and facilities, and limited public transport services. Surveys Conducted by Cambridgeshire ACRE also show service availability has already declined in some areas.</p> <p>If a local service or facility is lost to a settlement it will have an impact not only that particular local community but also to any smaller villages within its catchment. The value to the community of having local facilities may not be reflected in the commercial value of the property and policies are needed to ensure the value of such facilities is fully considered when considering proposals for more commercially valuable uses such as housing.</p> <p>The Local Plan needs to protect local services and facilities where the loss would cause an unacceptable reduction in the level of service provision in the locality. It needs to establish the issues that will be considered in determining the significance of the loss.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: It would not be a reasonable option to have no policy, as it could harm sustainability of settlements, and would be contrary to the NPPF. Alternatives exist regarding the tests applied to considering significance of the loss, and the facilities that are addressed.</p> <p>The current plan requires consideration of the established use and its potential contribution to local amenity, the presence and accessibility of alternatives, and the future economic viability (established by 12 months marketing). Alternative tests could be applied setting more detailed evidence requirements, providing greater detail on the quality of evidence required.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 81: A: Should the Local Plan seek to continue to protect where possible local services and facilities such as village shops, pubs, post offices, libraries, community meeting places, health centres or leisure facilities?</p>

	<p>B: Are there any other services and facilities that should be included?</p> <p>C: Should the Local Plan include the alternative more detailed and stringent tests proposed in Issue 81 for determining when an alternative use should be permitted?</p> <p>D: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?</p>
--	---

Issue 82	Developing New Communities
Key evidence	Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments. Also addressed in Area Action Plans.
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 69) states that Local planning authorities should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see.</p> <p>The option put forward in the issues and options report identifies the objectives that should be applied to new developments in the district. It has been guided by principles established by existing area action plans for major sites such as Northstowe (which were developed with community involvement), the principles established the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth, and issues raised in the early round of stakeholder workshops.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: None. The local plan needs to address the needs of new communities, and the issues and options consultation provides an opportunity for community input regarding the principles that should be applied.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 82: A: Do you agree with the principles of service provision in Issue 82? B: If not, why not? What alternative issues do you think should be included?</p>

Issue 83	Provision for sub regional sporting, cultural and community facilities
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts and Culture Strategy for the Cambridge Sub Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2006) • Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2006)
Existing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: DP/4 Infrastructure and New

policies	Developments.
Analysis	<p>Studies into arts, culture, and major sporting facilities undertaken for Cambridgeshire Horizons identified Cambridge as a possible location for new sub-regional facilities, including a community stadium, ice rink and concert hall. There are also proposals for a multi-lane rowing facility. Individual facilities are addressed in separate options.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Consultation provides an opportunity to gather views on the needs of the area.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 83:</p> <p>A: Is there a need for any other sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities that should be considered through the Local Plan review?</p> <p>B: If there is a need, what type and size of facility should they be?</p> <p>C: If there is a need, where is the most appropriate location?</p> <p>D: Is there a need for any other sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities that should be considered through the Local Plan review?</p> <p>E: If there is a need, what type and size of facility should they be? If there is a need, where is the most appropriate location?</p>

Issue 84	Community Stadium
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2006) Cambridge Community Stadium – Feasibility Study (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2007)
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>The term ‘community stadium’ is used to describe a stadium facility that delivers amenities and services to local communities beyond its core operations. These may include health, leisure and general community provisions and/or sports and education facilities, as well as local retail and other local businesses. A community stadium also aims to be accessible to the local community at all times during the day and evening, on weekdays and weekends. Studies have identified the potential benefit to the Cambridge Sub-Region of a community stadium, meeting the needs of one or more of its major sports clubs and providing supporting facilities to local communities.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Horizons undertook studies in 2006 and 2007 into the need for a community stadium and an appropriate location. The study used a range of evaluation criteria including site size, proximity to housing, ground condition, visibility, current facilities, neighbouring uses, other plans for the location, plans for neighbouring sites, planning status, transport and access, ownership and development implications, to test 10</p>

	<p>sites options: Cambridge East, Northstowe, the Southern Fringe, Cowley Road (Northern Fringe), North West Cambridge site, Blue Circle site, Barton Road, Cambridge Rugby Union FC, Milton, Arbury (Orchard) Park. It concluded three sites around the fringes of Cambridge could be suitable. These were Milton, Cambridge East and land at Cowley Road. However, all were found wanting - the Milton site is in the Green Belt and not well related to any community, for Cambridge East timing and availability was a barrier, and land at Cowley Road would restrict the size of stadium.</p> <p>For information, the Council has received a proposal from Grosvenor Estates to build a new Community Stadium adjacent to the Trumpington Meadows urban extension to Cambridge. The promoter's proposal is located in the Green Belt, within broad location 4, which is considered at Issue 12. Please note that the Council has not reached a view on the merits of the proposal and is consulting at this stage ONLY on the principle of providing a community stadium somewhere in the Cambridge area, and on the merits of the broad location in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge.</p> <p>The Local Plan could make provision for a Community Stadium and develop an appropriate policy. Any provision would be subject to proven need and support for such a facility as well as finding a suitable location. Whilst this option acknowledges that there may be a need for a Community Stadium it is subject to proven need along with finding a suitable location. As this facility would be to serve the whole of the Cambridge Sub-Region, this location may not necessarily be in South Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could make provision for a community stadium and develop an appropriate policy. Any provision would be subject to proven need and support for such a facility as well as finding a suitable location. As this facility would include facilities to serve the whole of the Cambridge Sub-Region as well as others for a more local community, this location may not necessarily be in South Cambridgeshire.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 84:</p> <p>A: Is there a need for a community stadium?</p> <p>B: If there is a need, what type and size of facility should it be, and where is the most appropriate location?</p>

Issue 85	Ice Rink
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2006)
Existing policies	
Analysis	The concept of an ice rink emerged a few years ago and was first referred to in the Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (2006, prepared by Cambridgeshire Horizons) which identified

	<p>gaps in sports provision within the Cambridge Sub-region. Analysis showed that there is demand for a facility and proposals have been developed by a group known as Cambridge Leisure Ice Centre (CLIC). The Major Sports Facilities Strategy recommended that an ice rink is developed with a vision to provide an ice centre which offers a range of ice based activities (ice hockey, public skating, figure skating, curling etc) with a focus on providing opportunities for community, local clubs and the University.</p> <p>CLIC have looked at various locations including North West Cambridge, Cambourne and West Cambridge but no firm proposals have been put forward.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could include provision for an ice rink and develop an appropriate policy. Any provision would be subject to proven need and support for such a facility as well as finding a suitable location. As this facility would serve the whole of the Cambridge Sub-Region, this location may not necessarily be in South Cambridgeshire.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 85: A: Is there a need for an ice rink in or near to Cambridge? B: If there is a need, where should it be located?</p>

Issue 86	Concert Hall
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts and Cultural Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2006)
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>The concept of a concert hall also emerged a few years ago in the context of growth in the Cambridge area and was first referred to in the Arts and Cultural Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (2006, prepared by Cambridgeshire Horizons) which identified gaps in arts and cultural provision within the Cambridge Sub-region. The analysis found that although there is a wide range of music venues at the small and medium scale in and around Cambridge, there is a growing interest in testing the case for a purpose built auditorium for large scale music. Cambridge East was suggested as a possible location for a purpose built concert hall. Whilst the proposal has not yet been taken forward, it is appropriate for the Issues and Options consultation to explore the issue</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could make provision for a concert hall and develop an appropriate policy. Any provision would be subject to proven need and support for such a facility as well as finding a suitable location. As this facility would be to serve the whole of the Cambridge Sub-Region, this location may not necessarily be in South Cambridgeshire.</p>
Final Issues and Options	<p>Question 86: A: Is there a need for a concert hall in or near to Cambridge?</p>

Approaches	B: If there is a need, where should it be located?
------------	---

Issue 87	Openspace Standards						
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Openspace and New Developments Supplementary Planning Document. • South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study Update 2012 						
Existing policies	<p>Development Control Policies DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outdoor Playspace, Informal Openspace and new developments (SF/10) • Openspace Standards (SF/11) 						
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 73) addresses the importance of access to open space to promote the health and wellbeing of a community and states that local authorities should set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities after they have assessed the quantity and quality of what is available within their area.</p> <p>The District Council has undertaken an audit and assessment of need for openspace, updating the previous assessment from 2005 that supported the Local Development Framework. The assessment was undertaken in consultation with Parish Councils, Sports Clubs and governing bodies. It concluded that the existing standards should be maintained.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The standard proposed has been identified by evidence collated in the Needs Assessment.</p> <p>The Local Plan should continue to require all new residential development to contribute to the provision of open space in new developments. The standards for provision should remain as the existing plan:</p> <p>Minimum standard of 2.8 hectares per 1,000 people, comprising:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Outdoor Sport</td> <td>1.6 hectares per 1,000 people</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Children's Play Space</td> <td>0.8 hectares per 1,000 people</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Informal Open Space</td> <td>0.4 hectares per 1,000 people</td> </tr> </table>	Outdoor Sport	1.6 hectares per 1,000 people	Children's Play Space	0.8 hectares per 1,000 people	Informal Open Space	0.4 hectares per 1,000 people
Outdoor Sport	1.6 hectares per 1,000 people						
Children's Play Space	0.8 hectares per 1,000 people						
Informal Open Space	0.4 hectares per 1,000 people						
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 95: A: Should the Local Plan continue to include a policy for open space provision?</p> <p>B: Do you agree with the standards of provision listed in Issue 87 that is similar to the current adopted policy?</p> <p>C: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p>						

--	--

Issue 88	Allotments
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Openspace and New Developments Supplementary Planning Document. • South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study Update 2012
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>Allotments were identified through the program of Local Plan Stakeholder workshops as a type of openspace that was not adequately addressed by the Local Development Framework. It was also identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report as an opportunity to support healthy lifestyles. Following research into supply and demand through the Audit and Assessment of need for openspace, an appropriate standard was recommended.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could include a requirement for allotments to be provided through new housing developments. The new assessment of open space needs identified that a standard of 0.4 hectares of allotments per 1,000 people, equivalent to around 32 allotments per 1,000 households, was appropriate for the district.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 88:</p> <p>A: Should major new housing developments include provision of allotments?</p> <p>B: Do you agree with the standard of provision proposed in Issue 88?</p> <p>C: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p>

Issue 89	Standards for On-Site Openspace Provision
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Openspace and New Developments Supplementary Planning Document. • South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study Update 2012
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: Outdoor Playspace, Informal Openspace and New Developments (SF/10)
Analysis	<p>The starting point for delivery of open space should be onsite, where it can meet the needs generated by development in the most directly accessible manner. This may not be practical on all developments, particularly as small developments would not generate sufficient need for standalone facilities of all types. In cases where it is not appropriate to provide onsite, developments will contribute to offsite provision, through planning obligations or potentially the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p> <p>The Local Plan needs to provide appropriate guidance regarding when onsite provision will be sought from different types of facility. Existing</p>

	<p>policy requires developments of 10 dwellings or above to include children’s playspace, because it is large enough to deliver a useful space capable of being maintained.</p> <p>Sports pitches and outdoor sport generally require a larger space, and need a larger scale of development to enable effective delivery. The Openspace SPD provides guidance seeking onsite provision from developments of 200 dwellings or more. The threshold for allotments has also been identified as 200 dwellings, sufficient to deliver a site of six typical allotment plots.</p> <p>On individual sites negotiation may take place on the types of space provided on-site, taking account of the needs of the area, existing provision and deficiencies.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: None The Local Plan needs to establish when onsite provision is required. The standards proposed are based on a delivery of useable, functional spaces.</p> <p>Informal open space: all scales of development Children’s play space: 10 or more dwellings Sports pitches and outdoor sport: 200 or more dwellings Allotments: 200 or more dwellings</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 89: A: Do you agree the thresholds for when on-site open space will be required in new developments? B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p>

Issue 90	Allocations for Open Space
Key evidence	Audit and Assessment of Openspace in South Cambridgeshire 2012
Existing policies	Site Specific Policies DPD: SP/14 Allocations for Open Space
Analysis	<p>The Site Specific Policies DPD includes a number of land allocations for recreation. These were identified as a result of public consultation, and where opportunities were identified through previous plans. They are located in areas where open space assessments have identified a shortfall against standards. Their progress is monitored in the Annual Monitoring Report, and the latest assessment is outlined below:</p> <p>Extension to recreation grounds:</p> <p>1a. East of recreation ground, Over No known progress.</p> <p>1b. East of Bar Lane & north-west of Green Hedge Farm, Stapleford</p>

	<p>The Parish Council has advised that whilst there are currently no proposals to bring forward the extension to the recreation ground, it would like the allocation to remain.</p> <p>1c. North of Hatton's Road, Longstanton The Parish Council continues to work with the Council to bring forward this site as an extension to the recreation ground.</p> <p>1d. North of recreation ground, Swavesey The Parish Council has advised that whilst there are currently no proposals to bring forward the extension to the recreation ground, it would like the allocation to remain.</p> <p>1e. East of recreation ground, Impington The Parish Council has advised that when they have previously approached the landowner they have been told there is no possibility within the foreseeable future of them leasing or acquiring the land.</p> <p>Extension to school playing field:</p> <p>2f. Land at Primary School, Long Furlong, Over Planning permission was allowed on appeal for the erection of 28 dwellings and the provision of a playing field for Over Primary School in June 2007 (S/1114/06). The development has been completed. New recreation grounds:</p> <p>3g. East of Mill Lane, Impington The Parish Council has advised that there is currently no intention to bring forward this land for recreation uses.</p> <p>3h. South of Manor Park, Histon The Parish Council is currently in negotiation with Cambridgeshire County Council to secure a lease for use of this land for recreation.</p> <p>3i. Land at Barrowcroft, Gunns Lane, Histon The Parish Council has advised that there is currently no intention to bring forward this land for recreation uses.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Alternatives are to maintain the allocations in the new Local Plan, or to not carry them forward.</p>
Final Issues And Options Approaches	<p>Question 90: A: Should the Local Plan carry forward the existing allocations for recreation and open space? B: Are there other areas that should be allocated?</p>

Issue 91	Protection of Existing Recreation Areas
Key evidence	Audit and Assessment of Openspace in South Cambridgeshire 2012
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: SF/9 Protection of Existing recreation areas

Analysis	<p>One of the Council's corporate aims is to promote active and healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 74) states that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or • the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or • the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss. <p>Existing policy establishes a local approach, including requiring consideration of potential future demand, in consultation with local people and users. The District Council has undertaken an audit and assessment of need for openspace which should be referenced in seeking to demonstrate a surplus. These additional issues warrant inclusion in local policy.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Reflecting the NPPF the Local Plan should appropriately protect existing open spaces, sports and recreation facilities. Alternatives existing around individual criteria.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 91: A: Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking to protect existing playing fields and recreation facilities?</p> <p>B: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included.</p>

Issue 92	Indoor Community Facilities
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Assessment 2010
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments.
Analysis	<p>Indoor community facilities, including village halls, community halls, church halls and other publicly accessible facilities, play a crucial role in maintaining a sense of local identity, as well as provide a base for a variety of different groups and activities, from pre-school groups; to indoor mat bowls; to yoga; for meetings or for coffee mornings.</p> <p>In 2009 South Cambridgeshire District Council commissioned a community facilities assessment. The purpose of the audit was to understand the size and condition of village halls, community halls, church halls and other publicly accessible facilities across the District.</p> <p>It identified standard approach for indoor community space per capita</p>

	<p>that can be used when considering the needs generated by new development. In developing the standard it considered existing provision levels, good practice examples around the district, standards used elsewhere, and the views of the local community.</p> <p>It identified a standard of 0.11m² per capita, or 111m² per 1,000 populations. South Cambridgeshire has used this standard to guide negotiations on planning obligations since January 2010. A higher standard may be needed in new communities, where existing facilities do not exist.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Alternative approach could be to have no standard, and rely on site specific negotiation. The standard proposed has been identified by evidence collated in the local assessment; it is therefore identified as the only option.</p>
Final Issues And Options Approaches	<p>Question 92: A: Should the Local Plan include a policy for indoor community space provision? B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p>

Issue 93	Lighting, noise and odour issues
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document • Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals and Waste LDF
Existing policies	<p>Development Control Policies DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting (NE/14) • Noise Pollution (NE/15) • Development Principles DP/3
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that by encouraging good design, planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.</p> <p>Although artificial light is needed for safety and amenity, it can have negative effects if it is not properly designed or appropriately located. The Local Plan needs to ensure development proposals avoid adverse impact on nearby uses or the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Noise can have a significant impact upon environmental quality, public health and amenity. It is important that noise sensitive developments are located away from existing sources of significant noise, and that potentially noisy developments are located in areas where noise will not be such an important consideration or where its impact can be mitigated.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework requires that planning policies and decisions should aim to:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development • mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development, including through the use of conditions, while recognising that many developments will create some noise; and • identify and protect areas of tranquility which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. <p>Planning policies should ensure development is appropriate for its location. Policy needed to ensure no unacceptable impact on existing and planned development, and development would not be subject to unacceptable odour issues. Odour assessment should be required to accompany planning applications where there are potential odour issues.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Issues need to be addressed appropriately in the Local Plan, to ensure development is appropriate for the location.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 93: A: Should the Local Plan include policies dealing with lighting, noise, and odour issues?</p> <p>B: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?</p>

Issue 94	Contaminated land
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>The regime established by the Environmental Protection Act 1990 is designed to address the most serious contaminated sites. The planning system has a wider role to ensure all land contaminated by former uses within the District will be redeveloped and remediated to an appropriate standard for their intended use.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Policies are needed to require appropriate investigation, and to impose conditions to ensure land is of an appropriate standard for the proposed use.</p> <p>It is proposed that where development is proposed on contaminated land, or land suspected of being impacted by contaminants, the Council will require developers to investigate and identify any remedial measures that may be required. The Council will require best practice mechanisms to enhance remediation of contaminated sites to ensure land is of an appropriate standard for the proposed use, and</p>

	encourage in principle the transformation of land back into beneficial use.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 94:</p> <p>A: Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking appropriate investigation and remediation of contaminated land?</p> <p>B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p>

Issue 90	Air Quality
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document • South Cambridgeshire District Council Air Quality Strategy
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: Emissions (NE/16)
Analysis	<p>South Cambridge District Council has a general duty to protect its local area from air pollution and produce a Local Air Quality Strategy. Air quality is measured at various sites in the district, most of which follow the route of the A14. The A14 is congested on a regular basis between Bar Hill (to the West of Cambridge) and Milton (to the North North-East of Cambridge). This has resulted in the declaration of an Air Quality Management Area for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and PM10. There is also an AQMA in Cambridge City Centre.</p> <p>The Local Plan will need to ensure that relevant sensitive receptors such as residential development are not exposed to air quality that can have an adverse impact on health, and that mitigation measures are applied as necessary.</p> <p>Policies are also needed to consider the impact of development proposals on air quality, to prevent detriment to local amenity. Where significant increases in emissions covered by nationally prescribed air quality objectives are proposed, appropriate modelling should be required, to demonstrate air quality objectives will still be met.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan must include appropriate policies on air quality. Where development proposals would be subject to unacceptable air quality standards or would have an unacceptable impact on air quality standards, they should be refused.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 95:</p> <p>A: Should the Local Plan include a policy dealing with air quality?</p> <p>B: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?</p>

Issue 96	Low Emissions Strategies
Key	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary

evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Document South Cambridgeshire District Council Air Quality Strategy
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>Clear links have been established between air quality and land-use planning, with transport identified as the main source of pollutants in towns and cities.</p> <p>The Local Plan could require Low Emissions Strategies, a method of using the planning system to reduce emissions. Low emission strategies provide a package of measures to help mitigate the transport impacts of development. They complement other design and mitigation options, such as travel planning and the provision of public transport infrastructure. The main benefit of low emission strategies is to reduce transport emissions by accelerating the uptake of low emission fuels and technologies in and around a new development, and to promote modal shift away from car travel. Low emission strategies place the onus on developers to demonstrate how they can take all reasonable efforts to reduce the transport related emission impacts of a proposed development. Reducing emissions by a hierarchy of avoiding vehicle use, shifting to sustainable transport modes and improving emissions from the vehicle fleet.</p> <p>Further guidance is included in the current South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide SPD (www.scambs.gov.uk/ldf/spds) and good practice guidance has been produced by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA): http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/quality/air/air-quality/laqm/guidance/policy/</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could include a policy that requires proposals for development that have the potential to contribute significant emissions to the local area to prepare and implement a site-based Low Emissions Strategy (LES).</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 96: A: Should the Local Plan include a requirement for Low Emissions Strategies? B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p>

12. Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure

Issue 97	Planning for more Sustainable Travel
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: Planning for More Sustainable Travel (TR/1) • Development Control Policies DPD: Mitigating Travel Impact (TR/3) • Development Control Policies DPD: Non-motorised Modes (TR/4)
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 30) states ‘Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.’</p> <p>‘Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in this Framework, particularly in rural areas.’ (paragraph 34)</p> <p>‘Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable modes for the movement of goods or people. Therefore, developments should be located and designed where practical to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies; • Give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities; • Create safe and secure layouts which minimize conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians, avoiding street clutter and where appropriate establishing home zones; • Incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra low emission vehicles; and • Consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.’ (paragraph 35) <p>‘Planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths...’ (paragraph 37)</p> <p>The rural nature of the district means that many people need to travel long distances to meet their day to day needs. South Cambs has a high rate of car ownership and many are using their cars, as distances are often too great to walk and cycle, and public transport services are often limited or inaccessible. However, short trips of less than two miles make up over 25% of trips, therefore there is an opportunity to target some of these to be made on foot or on bicycle. Even for longer trips there is the opportunity to make part of the journey by a sustainable mode, for example, cycling from Park & Ride sites.</p> <p>The Local Plan Strategy should ensure development is located in the</p>

	<p>most appropriate locations, minimizing, wherever possible, the need to travel to meet day to day needs.</p> <p>The current policy seeks to maximize potential for modal choice, both within and outside the development. Other policy (TR/3) also requires development to mitigate its impact and this can be addressed, at least in part, by a Travel Plan which can include a number of measures for increasing modal choice, including addressing behavioural choices as well as through provision of new and/or improved infrastructure.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>Current policy adheres to Government guidance which requires the Council to protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable modes for the movement of goods or people.</p> <p>Issue 97 sets out a number of principles for sustainable travel including improving and maximising opportunities for modal choice, fully addressing impacts of travel, with particular emphasis on non-car modes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments should not be approved that are likely to give a significant increase in travel demands, unless the site has or can provide sufficient standard of accessibility, offers an appropriate level of travel choice by walking, cycling or public transport. • Developments should be expected to address the transport issues they generate, such as through improvements to provide safe road access, improvements to the road, footway or cycleway network, or to address environmental impacts such as noise or air quality. This could be through the direct provision of transport infrastructure through the development, or financial contributions through planning obligations or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), to address transport infrastructure in the wider area. • Development can provide opportunities to encourage sustainable travel, and, in particular, increase the use of non-car modes (public transport, walking and cycling), by providing safe, direct routes that offer people real travel choice for some or all of their journey. Developers should be expected to demonstrate they have maximised opportunities to integrate travel modes, and access by non-motorised modes. • New cycle and walking routes should connect to existing networks, strengthening connections between clusters of villages, and Northstowe, Cambridge, and market towns. • In a rural area like South Cambridgeshire, the wider Rights of Way network provides an important resource for walkers, and in some cases, for cyclists and horse riders. As well as providing links between villages, they offer leisure and recreation routes improving access to the surrounding countryside as part of a healthy lifestyle. Developments should protect such routes, and
--	--

	may provide opportunities for improvement to the network.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 97: Should the Local Plan include the principles regarding sustainable travel in outlined in Issue 97, and are there any additional issues that should be included?

Issue 98	Transport Assessments and Travel Plans
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan Cambridge Corridor Area Transport Plans
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Control Policies DPD: Mitigating Travel Impact (TR/3)
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 30) states ‘Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.’</p> <p>‘Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development...’ (paragraph 31)</p> <p>‘All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment.’ (paragraph 32)</p> <p>The current policy threshold for requiring a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan conforms with PPG13. The NPPF does not define ‘significant amounts of movement’.</p> <p>South Cambs has high levels of through traffic and long distance commuting, both on the trunk road and the county’s primary road network. High house prices, results in substantial amounts of travel from elsewhere in the county or beyond into Cambridge. Radial routes into the city are regularly congested, particularly during peak periods, and traffic queues often back up into South Cambs with resultant impacts on air quality, safety, noise etc. for local communities living nearby. The level of growth planned for South Cambs and Cambridge will put further pressure on existing transport infrastructure and will require a proportionate investment to develop the transport network. There are capacity issues on some routes which could impact on the ability to accommodate further development without investment to resolve congestion issues.</p> <p>Given the existing constraints on parts of the transport network even small levels of additional traffic may be considered to have a significant impact, therefore it may be appropriate to set a local threshold for when a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be required.</p>

	<p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Given the existing constraints on parts of the transport network it is proposed to maintain the current policy threshold for the requirement of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. Smaller developments may still be required to submit them when there are particular transport issues.</p> <p>(The level of detail required (i.e. Transport Assessment or Statement) will depend on the development proposal, location and existing conditions. Where appropriate, a Travel Plan will be required to demonstrate potential to achieve a sustainable modal split).</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 98: A: Should the Local Plan continue to require 'major developments' to produce a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, as well as smaller developments with particular transport implications? B: Should an alternative threshold be used, if so what, and why?</p>

Issue 99	How Car Parking is provided within Residential Developments
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document • Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: Car and Cycle Parking Standards (TR/2)
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 39) states, 'If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the accessibility of the development; • the type, mix and use of development; • the availability of and opportunities for public transport; • local car ownership levels; and • an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.' <p>This represents a change of policy from previous government guidance (PPG13), which specifically required maximum parking standards to be set.</p> <p>Car ownership and car use should not be confused as being the same. Where good convenient pedestrian or cycle routes, or public transport, facilities are provided, people may choose to use those in preference to driving for regular journeys. However they will very likely own a car for convenient use for other journeys.</p> <p>Dwelling size and type are major factors in determining car ownership levels. Larger dwellings are more likely to be inhabited by more people of driving age and/or households with larger incomes, whilst smaller dwellings tend to be occupied by single-person households. In rural areas such as South Cambs car ownership levels are comparable for both rented and owner-occupied households, as there is a greater dependence on using private cars to access facilities.</p> <p>Overall the average number of vehicles per household identified in the</p>

2001 census falls within the policy requirement; with average vehicle ownership levels per household in all the Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, except one, being 1.5 or less; and average vehicle ownership levels per household in Group Villages and Infill Villages being between 1.6 and 2.0, except for seventeen villages which have lower levels due generally to having good access to facilities.

The Council's current plan reflects previous national policy and includes a set of maximum standards, indicating the maximum number of spaces per house allowed in a development. The Council could continue this approach, which could help promote more sustainable travel choice, but it could also mean insufficient parking where ownership is high, particularly in more remote parts of the district. This can result in spill-over parking in inappropriate and sometimes dangerous locations, causing nuisance and/or hazard to other road users. In particular, comments made to the Council about new developments are often that the road widths are too narrow and yet on-street parking takes place anyway and causes problems for other road users.

The use of the car may be becoming both more restricted and expensive but ownership of cars is expected to grow until 2021. This would suggest levels of car parking need to rise to accommodate the extra vehicles. The 2001 census showed average vehicle ownership levels per household in South Cambridgeshire's larger villages as typically 1.5 or less; and smaller villages typically between 1.6 and 2.0. The 2011 census figures are not yet available. In response, the local plan could raise the current maximum standards in the new Local Plan to allow for current and future levels of demand.

A further option would be to include no standard. This would allow for a design-led approach whereby car parking provision could be tailored to reflect the specific development in terms of its location (whether there are local services available which may reduce the need to travel long distances by car), the density of development, the residential properties proposed (whether flats or large houses), together with consideration of any 'smart' measures being incorporated into the development, (such as car clubs), which may reduce the level of need for private car parking.

This third approach could potentially lead to better quality of built design, with potentially less land required for car parking if it is provided in innovative way, for example on appropriately designed streets and/or in small communal car parking areas which can be designed into the 'street scene'. It would allow greater flexibility for some developments, in appropriate locations, to reduce overall levels of car parking. Disadvantages are that it would provide less clarity to developers.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

A range of alternative approaches has been identified:

- i. Current policy sets a maximum standard of an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling, up to a maximum of 2 spaces per 3 or more bedrooms in poorly accessible areas (garages count as parking spaces). Lower parking levels may be sought in areas with good accessibility to services,

	<p>facilities, and public transport in appropriate circumstances.</p> <p>ii. An alternative option is that the level of provision could be raised slightly to take into account rising levels of car ownership. This could retain an average of <u>1.5 spaces per dwelling for developments on the edge of Cambridge</u>, but increase to an average of <u>2 spaces per dwelling across the remainder of district</u>, with an average of <u>2.5 spaces per 3 or more bedrooms in less accessible areas</u>.</p> <p>iii. A further option could be to remove all car parking standards and make developers determine a suitable level of car parking provision through a comprehensive design-led approach, reflecting the location, (whether there are local services available which may reduce the need to travel long distances by car), the density of development, the residential properties proposed (whether flats or large houses), together with consideration of any 'smart' measures being incorporated into the development, (such as car clubs), which may reduce the level of need for private car parking. The developer would need to demonstrate that they have provided enough car parking to ensure highway safety. Further guidance could be provided in the District Deign Guide SPD.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 99:</p> <p>A: What approach should the Local Plan take towards residential car parking standards? (note – all options are subject to achieving appropriate highway safety)</p> <p>i. Maximum parking standards - an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling, up to a maximum of 2 spaces per 3 or more bedrooms in poorly accessible areas.</p> <p>ii. Maximum parking standards - an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling for developments on the edge of Cambridge, but increase to an average of 2 spaces per dwelling across the remainder of district, with an average of 2.5 spaces per 3 or more bedrooms in poorly accessible areas.</p> <p>iii. Remove all car parking standards and adopt a design-led approach to car parking provision in new developments.</p> <p>B: Are there any alternative polices or approaches you think should be included?</p>
<p>Issue 100</p>	<p>Allocation of Car Parking within Residential Developments</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document • Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm

Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Car and Cycle Parking Standards (TR/2)
Analysis	<p>The CLG's publication Residential Car Parking Research (May 2007) highlights that allocating car parking spaces to specific properties reduces the efficiency of car parking provision as not all households own a car. Car parking spaces will be provided but not used, especially where this provision is on-plot, whilst some other households may have more cars than allocated spaces, requiring additional spaces to be provided to accommodate these vehicles. Maximum flexibility and therefore efficient use of car parking spaces is attained through providing unallocated parking spaces. To maximise the efficiency of car parking provision the allocation of more than half of parking spaces is discouraged. The developer should propose a design-led approach to the incorporation of car parking within the development, appropriate to the site location and the residential typologies proposed, that addresses the need for allocated and / or unallocated spaces for residents and visitor parking. Some scales and locations of development may enable provision of alternatives such as car clubs to be provided.</p> <p>Provision of unallocated parking also allows for provision of electric charging points for cars in locations accessible to the whole development and provision of car sharing schemes.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. In order to maximise the efficiency of car parking provision across the whole development, it could require parking spaces to not be allocated to individual properties. This would reduce the overall levels of car parking needed to serve the development as a whole. ii. An alternative option would be to only allocate a proportion of car parking spaces needed to serve the whole development to individual properties, for example one space per dwelling. The design of the development could incorporate safe areas on-street or in designated areas to ensure additional cars can be parked without nuisance or hazard to other road users. This could ensure that on-street parking is properly designed into a development and help avoid the concerns often raised about new developments. iii. Alternately the Local Plan could not set a specific requirement, and the issue could be left to the design of individual developments to consider.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 100 A: What approach should the Local Plan take to the allocation of car parking spaces in residential developments?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Local Plan should maximise the efficiency of car parking provision by not allocating any residential car parking to individual properties. ii. The Local Plan should only allocate a proportion of the car parking spaces to individual properties.

	<p>iii. The Local Plan should not address the allocation of parking spaces, and it should be left to the design of individual developments.</p> <p>B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p>
--	---

Issue 101	How Car Parking is provided within Residential Developments
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document • Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>Current policy counts garages towards parking provision. However, where developers provide garages they are often of a size standard that relates to older cars of smaller size than their modern counterparts and residents find it difficult to garage their vehicles, resulting in garages being under used. Also residents frequently use garages as storage, due to the inadequate levels of storage provided within homes, which also displaces parking. For garages to count towards parking provision they should be of a minimum size to address the required purposes.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>The Local Plan could specify minimum dimensions for residential garages that are able to accommodate modern cars, cycles and other storage needs before they can be counted towards car parking provision.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 101: What approach should the Local Plan take to residential garages?</p> <p>i) Specify minimum size dimensions for garages to count towards parking standards, to ensure they are large enough to easily accommodate modern cars, cycles and other storage needs; or</p> <p>ii) Not address the issue of residential garage sizes.</p>

Issue 102	Car Parking Standards for Other Types of Developments
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document • Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Car and Cycle Parking Standards (TR/2)
Analysis	The Council's existing plan includes maximum parking standards for non-residential development, providing a range of different thresholds for different uses including employment, retail and community uses.

	<p>Whilst these are maximum standards, the Council may still require a certain level of parking from individual developments on a case by case basis, in order to secure highway safety.</p> <p>Current parking standards for non-residential uses seek to maximize opportunities to share car parking where uses permit; for example where uses require parking at different times of day.</p> <p>The provision of disabled car parking bays will need to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act and Part M of the Building Regulations.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Council's current plan sets maximum parking standards for a range of non-residential uses. It also encourages shared use of car parking, particularly in mixed-use developments where there is a mixture of day time and night time uses. These could be carried forward into the new Local Plan.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 102: Should the Local Plan carry forward the maximum parking standards for non-residential development included in its existing plan?</p>

Issue 103	Cycle Parking Standards
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Control Policies DPD: Car and Cycle Parking Standards (TR/2)
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 30) states 'Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.'</p> <p>Nearly all of South Cambs is within 10km of Cambridge or a market town, which is a reasonable cycling distance.</p> <p>The current district-wide approach to cycle parking is a minimum of 1 secure cycle space per dwelling, although higher standards apply to developments on the edge of Cambridge and Northstowe. Given the emphasis on encouraging more sustainable travel this is very low and the plan could include higher standards.</p> <p>One approach would be to require one space per bedroom, similar to the Cambridge City standards.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>Retain existing minimum cycle parking standards.</p> <p>Retain minimum cycle parking standards but set new higher levels of provision.</p>

	Do not set any cycle parking standards and use a design-led approach where developers justify their parking provision through the Transport Assessment / Transport Statement / Travel Plan.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 103:</p> <p>A: What approach should the Local Plan take towards cycle parking standards?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Retain the current minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development. ii) Continue to set minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development, but develop new higher levels of provision. iii) Remove cycle parking standards, but include a policy requiring cycle parking provision, adopting a design-led approach <p>B: Are there any alternative polices or approaches you think should be included?</p>

Issue 99	Rail Freight Interchanges
Key evidence	Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Rail Freight Interchanges (TR/5) and Site Specific Policies DPD: Rail Freight (SP/18)
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 31) states ‘Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges...’</p> <p>‘Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.’ (paragraph 34)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire’s roads have higher than the national average heavy commercial vehicle traffic and the use of inappropriate routes can have considerable impacts on villages. Freight traffic is predicted to quadruple by 2030. It is important freight generating uses are located in suitable locations and freight operators are using the most appropriate routes for their journeys, both of which should minimise environmental impacts on local communities. In addition, removing freight from roads onto rail will improve road traffic congestion and environmental impacts.</p> <p>Given the importance of supporting the economic prosperity of the Cambridge area and the forecast growth in freight traffic is untenable the Local Plan will need to facilitate and encourage the sustainable movement of freight, including a shift to rail wherever possible.</p> <p>Current policy permits the development of rail freight interchanges and safeguards existing sites.</p>

	<p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>Government guidance is to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges, and current policies safeguard land to facilitate this approach.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 111: Should the Local Plan continue to protect rail freight interchange sites?</p> <p>Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p>

Issue 105	Airfields and public safety zones
Key evidence	South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Aviation Related Development Proposals (TR/6)
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 33) states ‘When planning for ports, airports and airfields that are not subject to a separate national policy statement, plans should take account of their growth and role in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. Plans should take account of this Framework as well as the principles set out in the relevant national policy statements and the Government Framework for UK Aviation.’</p> <p>South Cambs has a long association with flying and there are a number of established aerodromes and smaller airfields in the district. Aviation contributes to national, regional and local economies and there are a number of industries established on local airfields. Airfields can raise environmental issues, which need careful consideration to balance the different interests that can be in conflict. In particular, noise resulting from flying activities has been a source of complaints in the past and is still a very sensitive issue in some areas of the district.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>There are a number of established aerodromes and smaller airfields in the district.</p> <p>The current policy provides a number of criteria for assessing new airfields or flying sites, to ensure all the impacts are fully considered and, where necessary, appropriate conditions are applied, to ensure they remain compatible with surrounding land uses.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 105:</p> <p>A: Should the Local Plan continue to include a criteria-based policy for assessing and mitigating the impact of aviation related development proposals?</p> <p>B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?</p>

--	--

Issue 106	Cambridge Airport – Aviation Development
Key evidence	
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>Whilst Cambridge Airport remains in operation, consideration needs to be given to airport activity and the approach that would apply to any future aviation development proposals coming forward at Cambridge Airport in order to ensure that any development would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity. Whilst airports have permitted development rights which mean that some types of development in connection with the provision of services and facilities do not need planning permission, other proposals such as the construction or extension of a runway, or new passenger terminal above 500 square metres or increasing the size of the existing building by 15% or more would need planning permission and a policy to deal with any such proposals would be appropriate reasonable option for consultation.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: This option is to include a policy that would only permit aviation development at Cambridge Airport where it would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity. Whilst this approach will only apply where certain types of airport development need planning permission, it would allow for due consideration of the impact of any proposals on the surrounding environment and residential amenity.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Issue 106: A: Should the Local Plan include a policy that would only permit aviation development at Cambridge Airport where it would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity?</p> <p>B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?</p>

Issue 107	Provision of Infrastructure and Services
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan • Infrastructure Delivery Study
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Infrastructure and New Developments (DP/4) and Cambridge East Area Action Plan: Infrastructure Provision (CE/33).
Analysis	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to consider a wide variety of infrastructure needs, including transport. Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities (Paragraph 31).</p> <p>Local planning authorities should work with other authorities and</p>

	<p>providers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and • take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas. (paragraph 162) <p>Current policy requires suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms, including a requirement for future maintenance and upkeep of facilities. This is related to the nature and scale of the development and its potential impact.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS), in partnership with Cambridge City Council to explore infrastructure needs and costs, when and where infrastructure will need to be provided, the scale of funding needed to achieve this, and potential sources of funding. It will also identify infrastructure critical to the delivery of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Infrastructure provision will be funded through a number of sources. Mainstream funding, such as the County Council’s capital programmes, service providers’ investment programmes, and Government grant, together with developer funding through planning obligations (section 106 agreements) and the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan needs to include a policy regarding infrastructure provision, to require that development has made appropriate arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>The nature, scale and phasing of any infrastructure or funding sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact. Contributions could also be used to secure future upkeep or maintenance where this is deemed appropriate. This will be by means of either planning obligations and/or a future CIL.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 107: A: Should the Local Plan include a policy to require development to provide appropriate infrastructure? B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?</p>

13. Site Specific Issues

Issue 108	Cambridge East
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Cambridge East Area Action Plan
Analysis	<p>The development of a major new urban quarter for Cambridge at Cambridge East, comprising 10,000-12,000 new homes, was a key part of the spatial strategy in the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, and the Cambridge Local Plan. In February 2008, the Councils jointly adopted the Cambridge East Area Action Plan (AAP).</p> <p>Whilst Marshalls had been actively looking into relocation options for the airport activities since 2006, they announced in April 2010 that after a lengthy search, their favoured sites at Wyton and Waterbeach were not deliverable at the present time and they intended to remain at Cambridge Airport for the foreseeable future. This means that the Councils need to explore what this means for the future direction of development in their respective areas as well as how the current allocation should be dealt with through the review process.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The following alternative options have been identified for the way the new Local Plan deals with the Cambridge East site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the current allocation for development at Cambridge East – The allocation could remain ‘live’ in case the area became available for development. This would provide flexibility, but as it could not be relied upon the Council could not include the housing numbers in its calculations towards meeting need. It could also create uncertainty and any implications for the delivery of development proposals elsewhere would need to be considered. • Safeguard it for possible future development after 2031 - Safeguarding the site would mean that it could be brought forward through a future plan review if Marshall's plans were to change, but there is no certainty it will ever become available. This approach is consistent with the NPPF and would provide flexibility for the future whilst also providing certainty to developers of other allocations in the Local Plan that their sites can come forward. • Return either the whole site to the Green Belt to reflect the original Green Belt boundary, or just the open parts of the site. The land was removed from the Green Belt for the purpose of housing-led development, and as this is no longer anticipated a further option is to return some or all of the land to the Green Belt.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 108: What approach should the Local Plan take to Cambridge Airport?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Retain the current allocation for development at Cambridge East. ii. Safeguard the site for development after 2031 or through a review of the Local Plan. iii. Return the whole site to the Green Belt or just the parts of the site which are open

Issue 109	Cambridge East – North of Newmarket Road
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Cambridge East Area Action Plan
Analysis	<p>Land north of Newmarket Road and north and west of the Park and Ride was identified in the Area Action Plan for development for 1,500 to 2,000 new homes. It is not constrained by the Airport relocation and could come forward for development on its own. It lies almost entirely within South Cambridgeshire District. It had been expected that the site would be developed by 2016, but no significant progress has yet been made and we need to decide what to do with the site in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The housing targets do not currently take any account of development North of Newmarket Road given the uncertainty that it can be relied on to deliver new housing. The future of the site needs to be established in the new Plan.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Council could:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Conclude that development cannot be relied on and the site be treated in the same way as Cambridge Airport. ii. Rely on the existing Cambridge East Area Action Plan policies to guide any development that might come forward north of Newmarket Road. iii. Include a new specific policy for the site in the Local Plan allocating the land for a housing-led development.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 109: What approach should the Council take to the potential for housing development on land North of Newmarket Road at Cambridge East? Should the Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Conclude that development cannot be relied on and the site be treated in the same way as Cambridge Airport? ii) Rely upon the policies of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan to determine any planning applications for development? iii) Include a new policy for the site in the Local Plan allocating the land for a housing-led development?

Issue 110	Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment Land Review Update 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2010 • Cambridge Cluster at 50 • Cambridge Northern Fringe East Viability Study
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Specific Policies DPD: SP/17 Rail Infrastructure
Analysis	<p>The Local development Framework safeguarded the Chesterton Sidings for the development of a railway station and interchange facility. The Secretary of State for Transport recently confirmed the decision that the proposed Chesterton Station will be developed, now to be known as Cambridge Science Park Station. The proposal will be taken into account in the forthcoming train operating franchises and the County Council have announced that they propose to borrow the necessary money to deliver</p>

the funding, with a proposed opening year of 2015. Repayment would be achieved through the franchises. The proposed railway station will be served by the guided busway from St.Ives.

The possibility of relocating the Waste Water Treatment Works was explored through the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan, South Cambridgeshire's Site Specific Policies DPD and the County Council's Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework. Viability and options work undertaken by Roger Tym and Partners in 2008 concluded that comprehensive redevelopment of the site would not be viable and alternative mainly employment-led development options should be explored. This approach is also consistent with the findings of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Employment Land Review (2008) and update (2011) and the Cambridge Cluster at 50 Study (2011).

Rather than produce a separate Area Action Plan, it was agreed by the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council in March 2011 that the future coordination and policy development for Cambridge Northern Fringe East should be incorporated within each Council's Local Plans.

The location forms part of a wider opportunity area for development with land in the City of Cambridge in the Cowley Road area, and it is proposed in the Cambridge Local Plan Issues and Options Report for high density mixed employment led development including associated supporting uses to create a vibrant new employment centre. This area also forms an area of search for a Household Recycling Centre to serve the North of Cambridge, and as a location for inert waste recycling. Any proposals for these facilities would need to be explored alongside other uses in the area.

Key principles for development could include:

- Regeneration of the wider area in a coherent and comprehensive manner;
- Provision of high density mixed employment led development including associated supporting uses to create a successful new employment centre;
- Development to achieve excellent standards of sustainability and design quality;
- To secure delivery of a major new transport interchange to service Cambridge and the Sub-region based on high quality access for all modes;
- Improvements to existing public transport access to and from Northern Fringe East, with extended and re-routed local bus routes as well as an interchange facility with the Guided Bus.
- Improved access for cyclist and pedestrians.
- Delivery of high quality, landmark buildings and architecture; and
- To minimise the environmental impacts of the WWTW and to support greater environmental sustainability in the operation of the site.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

Chesterton Sidings is the only part of the area within South Cambridgeshire. The Station forms part of the Local Transport Plan, and is a major element of the transport strategy for Cambridge.

Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 110: What do you think are the key principles for the development of Cambridge Northern Fringe East?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Do you agree with our vision for the area? ii. Have we identified the right key principles for development? iii. What sites should be included in the boundary of the area?
-------------------------------------	--

Issue 111	Papworth Hospital site, Papworth Everard
Key evidence	
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Specific Policies DPD: SP/10 Papworth Everard Village Development
Analysis	<p>Papworth Hospital, located in Papworth Everard, is the UK's largest specialist cardiothoracic hospital and the country's main heart and lung transplant centre. In 2005 Papworth Hospital decided to move to the Biomedical Campus at Addenbrookes. This will provide new facilities with the benefit of immediate access to the range of services, facilities and research that takes place there. The construction of the new building is anticipated by 2016.</p> <p>As part of preparing the Local Development Framework, the Council consulted on options for what should happen to the site once the hospital is relocated. It was determined that the site should remain in employment uses, seeking a health care user as a preference. Residential use of the site was rejected, in order to maintain the employment balance in the village.</p> <p>The Local Plan review provides an opportunity to consider whether that approach remains appropriate. The site has been suggested for residential led development through the call for sites for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p> <p>The village has undergone substantial development. The County Council's Structure Plan of 1989 identified it as a location for an additional 1,000 homes in response to a perceived need to create a more balanced community. Previous Local Plans allocated land for development in four locations on the edge of the village. The industries in the centre of the village have now disappeared and in their place is arising an imaginative mix of high-density housing, some employment, a village green and shopping and community services. A new business park is nearly complete on the southern edge of the village, as a replacement for the industries lost from the village centre.</p> <p>The Hospital provides over 1000 jobs in the village, delivering over one third of the jobs in the Papworth and Elsworth Ward. The ratio of jobs to economically active people was 0.89 in 2010 (source: Cambridgeshire ATLAS). The loss of employment from the hospital site would therefore have a significant impact on the economy of the village, and the ability of people to find work locally.</p>

	<p>A healthcare use would achieve the continuance of the mutually beneficial relationship between hospital and village. The hospital site currently includes a number of operating theatres, labs, and wards that accommodate patient beds, which could continue to be used by an alternative occupier. The existing policy seeks marketing to begin as soon as possible, to provide the maximum opportunity to find a suitable occupier. It also provides flexibility, to market for other users if one does not, two years before final closure.</p> <p>Other employment uses on the Hospital site would at least maintain a balance between homes and jobs in the village, but would not provide the current jobs profile, make best use of the existing resources, or reflect the history and character of the village.</p> <p>A residential led mixed use housing site could contribute to wider housing needs, but result in an alteration in the homes jobs balance of the village, and result in another significant scale residential development in this settlement in addition to the recent 1000 dwellings, and those anticipated on Papworth West Central. The merits of the site as an option for residential development are addressed separately.</p> <p>In all cases, care would need to be taken to retain buildings of character which reflect the Hospital's origins, and consider impacts on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Options are to seek health care or employment re-use of the site, or residential.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 111: What should the Papworth Hospital site be used for when the hospital relocates to Addenbrooke's?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) A preference for continuation of healthcare on the site, and only if a suitable user cannot be found, other employment uses compatible with adjoining residential; ii) Employment uses that would be compatible with adjoining residential; iii) Housing led development, including mixed uses.

Issue 112	Papworth West Central, Papworth Everard
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Site Specific Policies DPD: SP/10 Papworth Everard Village Development
Analysis	<p>Papworth West Central provides an opportunity to take a comprehensive approach to brownfield sites in the centre of Papworth Everard. The area contains a number of buildings that have reached the end of their structural life, or that are not currently in use. Rather than piecemeal development, there is an opportunity for considerable environmental improvement, and benefit to the functioning of the village, if a coordinated approach is taken to its development. There are particular opportunities to support the continued development of the centre of the village, particularly now the bypass has been completed.</p> <p>It is important to ensure that a mix of uses is achieved on this significant site, and that it does not become purely residential led. There has been a</p>

	<p>considerable amount of residential development in the village over the last decade and there is more to come. The four quadrants schemes will deliver in total over 1000 dwellings, and there has also been substantial residential development on the former factory site in the village centre.</p> <p>This opportunity for area based regeneration has been recognised by the Council and other stakeholders, including Papworth Everard Parish Council. Progress has been made exploring site proposals.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Retain policy to seek a mixed use redevelopment of this opportunity site to deliver a sustainable form of development and the continued invigoration of the village centre, or deal with proposals on their merits.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 112: How can we best invigorate Papworth Everard?</p> <p>i) Should the Local Plan include a specific policy to seek mixed-use development with community uses, employment and housing development?</p> <p>ii) Or should we not include a policy and deal with individual site proposals on their merits</p>

Issue 113	Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate Supplementary Planning Document (2011)
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site Specific Policies DPD: SP/11 Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate
Analysis	<p>The Land Settlement Association's activities at Fen Drayton are an earlier example of an attempt to achieve a more sustainable form of living but with the passage of time this has not proved to be an enduring model. The current legacy of the experiment is a network of small land holdings, a wide variety of land uses including some disuse, and a patchwork of buildings of variable quality. In view of the area's history and its current appearance, form and character this policy a policy was developed in the Local Development Framework to allow it to evolve as a positive experimental test-bed for new forms of sustainable living. The policy focuses on utilising the built footprint of existing buildings no longer needed for agriculture, in order to protect the rural nature of the site.</p> <p>Following stakeholder and public consultation, a supplementary planning document (SPD) was adopted in May 2011 to guide how the policy should be implemented. It identified eligible buildings, and provided design guidance for new development. In particular it defined the sustainability standards development must achieve, Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 (or Level 5 in some circumstances) and any new non-residential buildings must achieve BREEAM non-residential outstanding standard.</p> <p>The SPD establishes the following principles for development to achieve: Design and construction of highly energy efficient buildings. Provision of renewable energy technologies to provide heat and power e.g. solar thermal panels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of a garden and allotment for each dwelling to encourage food production. Inclusion of either rainwater harvesting or greywater recycling (capturing rainwater or waste water for reuse by the occupiers).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which naturally manage surface water run-off through the use of permeable surfaces and ponds. • Minimisation of waste and inclusion of suitable storage for waste and recycling. • Enhancement of the biodiversity and ecology of the site. • Promotion and facilitation of opportunities that would allow an increase in the use of sustainable forms of transport and a reduction in car use. <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Continue the policy approach, or do not carry forward and resist unsustainable development in the countryside.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 113: What approach should the Local Plan take to the Fen Drayton LSA Area?</p> <p>i) Continue to support the redevelopment of existing buildings on the former Fen Drayton LSA site to support on-site experimental or other forms of sustainable living?</p> <p>ii) How do you think the former Fen Drayton LSA should evolve?</p>

Issue 114	Great Abington Former Land Settlement Association Estate
Key evidence	
Existing policies	None.
Analysis	<p>A second former Land Settlement Associate site in the district at Great Abington also has a different character to the open countryside around it. It includes a range of houses set along a pattern of narrow private roads, ranging from very small cottages that remain below the standards normally expected in modern life, to larger properties that have previously been extended. They generally sit in very large plots. Great Abington Parish Council has considered this issue locally with its community and there is support for an approach in the plan that reflects the specific local circumstances in the former LSA.</p> <p>The former Great Abington LSA is currently subject to the same controls over extensions to existing houses in the countryside and also the redevelopment of rural houses as the rest of the open countryside. Experience suggests that this area requires more flexibility to deal with the range of properties and the substandard nature of some housing. If the new plan contains a policy that retains the existing limits on new residential development, there would be a case to take a different approach in the former Great Abington LSA area, providing greater flexibility and to treat applications on their merits on the basis of local character and the impact of the proposed development on the openness of the countryside and local amenity. If however, the new plan includes a more flexible policy that considers applications on the basis of local character and the impact of the proposed development on the openness of the countryside and local amenity, there would not be a need to include a specific policy for this area.</p> <p>The submission from Great Abington Parish Council dated May 2012,</p>

	<p>concerning extensions to dwellings in the Land Settlement Association area advocates the creation of a special policy area for the LSA governed by the following policy criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Estate remains outside the village envelope 2. The broadly rural nature of the Estate should be preserved with all public footpaths and rights of way for horse riders retained. 3. The roads will remain un-adopted by the Council and all residents using them will continue to be responsible for all ongoing road and pathway maintenance including a distance of one metre either side of the road. 4. Reasonable developments can proceed within the area as long as it would not result in a significant adverse impact on the unique character or appearance of the Estate and would not result in an adverse impact on residential amenity or create unacceptable disturbance. 5. All new building designs should be in keeping with the original housing stock on the Estate. 6. No development should be allowed that would result in a substantial increase in traffic on the Estate, or the need for significant related road development, such as businesses that by their nature require large numbers of vehicle movements. 7. Extensions to existing dwellings will be allowed as long as they do not result in a building that has a floor area exceeding 250 Square metres and is in keeping with others in the area. However, the dwelling must continue to sit comfortably within its plot. 8. The demolition and replacement of properties should be allowed as long as the new building does not exceed the floor area of the existing dwelling, or 250 Square metres whichever is larger, and it is in keeping with others in the area. However, the dwelling must continue to sit comfortably within its plot. 9. Each of the original 62 houses may be allowed to convert one existing outbuilding to a dwelling as long as adequate distances between neighbouring properties can still be maintained and the new building has a floor area of no more than 150 Square metres and is in keeping with others in the area. 10. All new or replacement dwellings should be set back from the roads at least as far as the original dwellings but will not be placed significantly further back on the plot, however small scale extensions to the front of an existing building may be allowed where a reasonable case is made. <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: If the new Local Plan retains the existing approach to extensions and redevelopment, there would be a case to take a different approach in the former Great Abington LSA area, providing greater flexibility. If however, the new Local Plan includes a more flexible District wide policy, there would not be a need to include a specific policy for this area.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 114: Do you consider that if the Local Plan retains limits on the scale of extensions to existing dwellings or the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside, a different approach should be taken in the former Great Abington Land Settlement Association area to provide greater flexibility?</p>

Issue 115	Linton Special Policy Area
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: CH/10 Linton Special Policy Area
Analysis	<p>The southern part of Linton is severed by the A1307 bypass from the rest of the village, which provides a barrier to easy movement. The area is characterised by three distinct uses; employment, a sensitive residential area much of which lies within the Conservation Area, and the site of Linton Zoo. Its location means that it has poor access to the village facilities and services, although there is a pelican crossing providing safe access to a bus stop on the Cambridge facing side of the main road providing a safe crossing point. Bus services between Cambridge and Haverhill have been improved and this crossing is now well used.</p> <p>Part of the existing employment area has been suggested to the Council as a possible housing site and been tested as part of the plan making process. It performs well as a housing site against many criteria, being within a larger village and a previously used site. The main disadvantage of the site for housing is the loss of the employment use and its location in the southern part of Linton.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could continue restricting further residential development south of the A1307 at Linton, or not include a policy.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 115: Should the Local Plan continue to restrict residential development south of the A1307 at Linton?

Issue 116	The Imperial War Museum site at Duxford Airfield
Key evidence	
Existing policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Control Policies DPD: CH/11 Duxford Imperial War Museum
Analysis	<p>The Imperial War Museum is a major tourist attraction based upon a long established airfield. Given its national significance, the District Council will give it special consideration within the context of protecting the quality of the surrounding landscape in this sensitive site on the edge of the Cambridge Green Belt.</p> <p>The existing Development Control Policies DPD establishes that the Imperial War Museum site at Duxford Airfield will be treated as a special case as a major tourist / recreation facility. Proposals will be considered with regard to the particular needs and opportunities of the site, but must be associated with the continued use of the site as a museum of aviation and modern conflict. Details of projected increases in aircraft noise will be required with all proposals which would lead to increased flying activity.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The importance of the museum is reflected in the current policy.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 116: Should the Local Plan maintain the approach to development at the Imperial War Museum at Duxford, that it must be associated with the continued use of the site as a museum of aviation and

	modern conflict?
--	------------------