

Chapter 8: Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Paragraphs 8.1 to 8.11 Introductory Paragraphs	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 0 Object: 8
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 8.4 indicates that growth in the R&D sector will be slower than in the past and other sectors will account for a higher proportion of growth. Evidence suggests that this will not be the case. The Cambridge area has a truly exceptional level of R&D employment, more than any other district. • Insufficient land allocated in the right locations to accommodate the level of required employment need and support the economy. The employment land proposed for allocation is either not available, not suitable or will be subject to deliverability issues. Provision for B use class employment, particularly B1(b) R&D uses in Cambridge is location sensitive. Employers want to be located in, or on the edge of Cambridge. An additional 112,700 sq m of employment floor space on 31 ha of land is needed. This represents an additional 2,700 jobs. • Objection proposes a science park at Cambridge South that would meet the forecast employment land requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ in the most sustainable location that is accessible by public transport in a location attractive to occupiers and investors. ○ Promote and facilitate the expansion of Cambridge's world class knowledge and high technology cluster in Cambridge. ○ Provide competition between providers and choice for occupiers, as the lack of planned provision is acting as a barrier to business growth. ○ Provide a strategic site for inward investment.
Assessment	<p>The Local Plan has responded to the National Planning Policy Framework by proactively encouraging sustainable economic growth. It identifies a range of strategic sites for development, as well as policy criteria for considering other sites. It plans to support the continued success of the high technology clusters, by ensuring sufficient sites are available but also providing additional flexibility to support their evolving needs.</p> <p>The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan is planning for 22,000 jobs, reflecting objectively assessed needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The Council's Employment</p>

Land Review (commissioned Jointly with Cambridge City Council) considered the land required to support this level of growth, including the employment sectors likely to grow, and the types and locations of land they would need. It estimated that this would need around 43 hectares, or 143,000m² to deliver the jobs in business land uses in South Cambridgeshire, and this has been reflected in paragraph 2.36 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

A number of forecasting models were used during the preparation of the plan, and the figure in 2.36 was based on the Local Economy Forecasting Model, by Cambridge Econometrics (LEFM). LEFM provides a robust model for predicting economic growth, and is used by many authorities across the country. The SHMA took the sensible approach of reviewing a number of forecasting models before determining the appropriate level of growth, recognising their limitations. It also considered the East of England Forecasting Model, by Oxford Economics (EEFM), which anticipates a similar level of jobs growth to the LEFM for South Cambridgeshire, but had differing results for Cambridge.

The two models provide their forecasts using a different set of employment sectors, therefore direct comparison is not straight forward, but as the EEFM anticipated growth used in the SHMA was so different for Cambridge, an update to the Employment Land Review was prepared to reconsider the results for the City. The comparison identified higher growth in offices and R&D sectors, but greater losses in industry. This information was then used in the Cambridge Local Plan.

If the assumptions in the update for Cambridge were applied to South Cambridgeshire, this would increase the need from 43 hectares to 56 hectares of employment land. It would show a higher proportion of new jobs in research and development, and less in offices, with greater loss of industry. However, a change to reflect the EEFM for consistency with Cambridge is not considered necessary. It would not require a change of strategy, policy approach or additional land allocations.

As well as raising the issue with the forecasts, one objector identifies a range of issues with the Employment Land Review which they consider would increase the land supply requirement. However, their approach to maximise the apparent need is not justified.

The Local Plan identifies a comfortable supply of employment

land, meaning that supply still exceeds the forecast need. The employment land position has been updated in the latest Annual Monitoring Report. There is now around 95 hectares of employment land with planning permission in the district. In addition, allocations brought forward through the adopted Local Development Framework such as Northstowe, will deliver new employment during the plan period.

The South Cambridgeshire Proposed Submission Local Plan identifies further new employment provision. On the edge of Cambridge, the Local Plan identifies Cambridge Northern Fringe East and an allocation at Fulbourn Road, as well as supporting the development of additional capacity at Cambridge Science Park. Outside Cambridge there will be additional capacity through new developments at Waterbeach New Town and Bourn Airfield new village.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans describe a good supply and range of employment sites, with new sites in and on the edge of Cambridge, new development opportunities at planned new settlements, completion of existing rural business parks and at the biotechnology parks south of Cambridge. Together these provide opportunities which exceed alternative supply requirements indicted by objectors. The types of site available reflect the need identified, with the local plans identifying some old industrial sites for redevelopment, whilst proposing new land for offices and research and development.

The Councils have responded appropriately to issues identified in the Joint Employment Land Review. In particular need in and on the edge of Cambridge where there is particularly high demand at the moment. A joint Area Action Plan is proposed for Cambridge Northern Fringe East, to bring forward a significant employment led development opportunity around the new Science Park Station. There are significant parcels of land in both districts. Development of this site is progressing, with the planning application recently being granted for the station, with completion anticipated in 2016. Additional opportunities are identified at Cambridge Station Area West, the Cambridge Science Park, and new allocations near the Peterhouse Technology Park. These are in addition to developments at North West Cambridge, West Cambridge, and the Addenbrookes Biomedical Campus.

Whilst some sites are restricted to specific types of user, such as the Biomedical campus or Northwest Cambridge, they will still deliver significant numbers of jobs in the types of uses that need a

	<p>Cambridge location. Other sites, such as Cambridge Northern Fringe East, Station Road, and the Land near Peterhouse, are not restricted.</p> <p>The Local Plans seek to protect existing stock and support the modernisation of sites to meet future employment needs. They provide a flexible framework for bring forward new sites and adapting existing ones.</p> <p>A range of policies in adopted plans and the Proposed Submission Local Plan support employment development, on established employment sites, in settlements, and the expansion of rural businesses where appropriate. They will continue to deliver windfall development.</p> <p>There is no evidence of need to justify a significant development in the Green Belt proposed by objectors at Cambridge South, which was tested through the plan making process and demonstrated to have a significant negative impact on the Green Belt. The Local Plans have to balance a range of factors, and the strategy selected is the most appropriate one for the area.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Policy E/1: New Employment Provision near Cambridge - Cambridge Science Park

<p>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 59</p>	<p>New Employment Provision near Cambridge</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Employment Land Review Update 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2010
<p>Existing policies</p>	<p>South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy: ST/8 Employment Provision</p>
<p>Analysis</p>	<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 existing 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 Hinxtun 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 or offices and research and development.</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.

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.

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.

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 of the Local Plan Issues and Options Report.

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.

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 Spatial Strategy chapter of the Local Plan Issues and Options Report explores the potential for growth through Green Belt review on the edge of Cambridge, and identifies and assesses 10 broad locations.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

- Densification on Cambridge Science Park
- Employment Development at Cambridge Northern Fringe East.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt review, through options identified in the strategy chapter. • Do not identify any of the above options.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
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"> Cambridge Northern Fringe East, and densification on the Cambridge Science Park? On new allocations on the edge of Cambridge which have previously been designated Green Belt (See identified broad locations in Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan Issues and Options Report) Both Option i and Option ii Neither Option i or Option ii
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Cambridge Northern Fringe East and Cambridge Science park provide an opportunity to deliver employment provision on previously developed land, in a highly accessible location. Reflecting the Employment Land Review, there are particular benefits to this location for supporting the continued success of the Cambridge area economy, hence the opportunity for significant positive impact on the economic objectives. Impacts on a number of objectives would depend on the form development would take, which would be addressed by other policies in the plan. There would be potential benefits to landscape and townscape and creating good places, as much of the land near Chesterton sidings is currently of poor quality. Opportunities to improve the science park could also be used to enhance the quality of the site.</p> <p>Impact of additional employment land through development on the edge of Cambridge would depend on site specific issues. The general locations have been considered in the Spatial Strategy chapter, and those impacts, particularly on landscape and</p>

	<p>townscape (the Green Belt), and land, are identified against individual broad location options. In general employment land on the edge of Cambridge could provide highly accessible employment, and depending on scale could have a significant positive impact on economic objectives.</p> <p>The need for employment provision in or on the edge of Cambridge was highlighted in the Employment Land Review. Not making provision (option iv) could therefore have negative impacts for the economic objectives.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i. Support: 23 Object: 0 Comment: 2 ii. Support: 4 Object: 5 Comment: 2 iii. Support: 5 Object: 0 Comment: 3 iv. Support: 4 Object: 0 Comment: 3</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Cambridge Northern Fringe East and / or the Science Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support in principle; • Not in Green Belt, accessible to new Railway Station; • Business has demonstrated a need to be located in the City; • Trinity College - Pleased Local Plan acknowledges importance of Cambridge Science Park and opportunities for densification. <p>New employment allocations on the edge of Cambridge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Need a range of quality sites, to help maximise the potential of the Cambridge economy; • Object: Green Belt should be protected;
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy which identifies the area around the new railway station at Chesterton Sidings as an opportunity to create a high density mixed employment led development including associated supporting uses to create a vibrant new employment centre.</p> <p>Include a policy supporting the redevelopment / intensification of Cambridge Science Park on the northern edge of Cambridge, subject to other policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>There was considerable support for these policies expressed in representations, and including policies would reflect the needs identified in the Employment Land Review 2012.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	<p>Policy E/1: New Employment Provision near Cambridge – Cambridge Science Park</p>

**Policy E/1: New Employment Provision near Cambridge - Cambridge Science Park
(and paragraphs 8.12 to 8.14)**

<p>Proposed Submission Representations Received</p>	<p>Total: 9 Support: 2 Object: 7</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trinity College Cambridge is pleased to note that the Local Plan identifies the importance of the Cambridge Science Park to assist in delivering employment growth through densification. There are already a number of examples of plots on the park that have been successfully reconfigured. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council / Caldecote Parish Council - Encourages commuting rather than encouraging extra employment growth at the major development sites. • A Masterplan should also be produced to show how the density of the existing Science Park could be increased. Car parking should be addressed as it is a waste of valuable land.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>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, particularly as some of the building stock comprises dated single storey buildings. The policy has been supported by the landowner, and forms a sound part of the plan.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Policy E/2: Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn)

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see also audit trail in Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy for Policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031.

Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1) Chapter 9	Site Option GB5: Fulbourn Road (East) – Potential Employment Allocation
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment Land Review Update (2012) • Inner Green Belt Study Review (2012) • Technical Assessment of Sites on the Edge of Cambridge (2012)
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>A technical assessment of a range of sites on the edge of Cambridge was undertaken, to identify land with potential for development.</p> <p>A parcel of land was identified east of Peterhouse Technology Park. The Technology Park is cut into rising ground and cannot be seen from the higher ground to the south. A similar treatment would be needed for this site. The site forms part of an open arable field. It is bounded by hedgerows, which could be retained and a new landscaped boundary created to the south and east.</p> <p>The site is particularly suited to employment development, and has the potential to respond to issues arising in the Employment Land Review, that there is demand for additional employment land on the edge of Cambridge.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>

Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 2: Which of the site options do you support or object to and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GB5: Fulbourn Road East
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Considered through the Joint Review of sites on the edge of Cambridge.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Support: 19 Object: 77 Comment: 14</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support if well designed as a small development adjacent to the urban area. (14) • Cambridgeshire County Council - Support the proposed employment use for this site from an economic development perspective. It forms a logical extension to the existing Peterhouse Technology Park and presents the opportunity to provide additional quality employment development for high tech related uses. • Support because accessible by public transport and bicycle, close to services so preferable to development in villages which would contribute to more commuting, traffic congestion, pollution, environmental impact. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsympathetic "ribbon" development of commercial premises on rising ground, which would be contrary to the fundamental Green Belt purposes; • Reduces the separation between Cambridge and Fulbourn. • The development would be highly visible from the high ground to the south - the roofs of the existing Technology Park are already prominent when viewed from Shelford Road. • Add to existing heavy traffic on Fulbourn Road. • Limited Public Transport services. • There is an acknowledged surplus of allocated employment land in South Cambridgeshire. • Development of the full site would harm the character and appearance of the nearby Conservation Area. Strongly recommend that the site does not extend to the east of Yarrow Road and that the southern boundary gets further consideration to ensure development is not built on the crest of the hill that rises to the south of the Fulbourn Road. (1) • Impact on local wildlife sites, including chalk pit SSSI; <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs effective landscape screening; • Should take opportunity to improve cycle links.

<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include as an employment allocation in the draft Local Plan. The site is suitable for employment development and has the potential to respond to issues arising in the Employment Land Review, that there is demand for additional employment land on the edge of Cambridge.</p> <p>The Peterhouse Technology Park is cut into rising ground and cannot be seen from the higher ground to the south. A similar treatment would be needed for this site and therefore development proposals will need to demonstrate how the site can be designed and landscaped to effectively mitigate impact on the wider Cambridge Green Belt and will need to include the creation of landscaped buffers on the southern and eastern boundaries.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy E/2: Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn)</p>
<p>Policy E/2: Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn) (and paragraph 8.15 to 8.16)</p>	
<p>Proposed Submission Representations Received</p>	<p>Total: 36 Support: 6 Object: 30</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council - Support the allocation of this site. Provides scope for on-going employment development at Peterhouse Technology Park. • English Heritage - welcome the consideration in part 2 of the setting of new development into the landscape in this location. • Natural England - welcome specific reference to landscape, biodiversity and GI requirements for relevant developments • Support if policy requirements are fully applied. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn Parish Council – Parish Plan opposed to changes to Green Belt in village. Contrary to proposed policies S/2, S/4, NH/2, NH/3 and NH/13. • The land immediately adjoining Peterhouse Technology Park, in the Parish of Fulbourn, is in the ownership of a charity which has no intention to dispose of this land. Request it is removed from plan. Important to character of Fulbourn and the Green Belt. • Impact on the Green Belt, highly visible from the south east, and will merge Cambridge towards Fulbourn. • Exceptional circumstances required for development in the Green Belt have not been demonstrated. There are other sites

	<p>available for employment in Cambridge, and on Capital Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The December 2012 Inner Green Belt Appraisal assessing the importance of the Green Belt in this location is flawed and contains errors and inconsistencies. • There may be insufficient planning control to ensure that these sites are released for employment purposes that support the Cambridge Cluster. Should be restricted to firms that have a need. • Fulbourn Road already busy at peak times. Need improved safety measures for pedestrians and cyclists. • Should retain land south of roundabout in case there is a future proposal for southern relief road. • Loss of agricultural land.
Assessment	<p>The Green Belt Boundary Review 2012 indicates that the land is capable of development without significant harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. It is therefore removed from the Green Belt. The Local Plan's approach is sound.</p> <p>The Joint Employment Land Review indicated a need for additional employment land in and on the edge of Cambridge. It therefore provides an opportunity to help address these employment needs, although the soundness of the plan is not reliant on this site. Whilst the landowner has no current intention to dispose of the land, this could change during the plan period and it remains a good site for employment development as an extension to the Peterhouse Technology Park.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/3: Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses

Policy E/4: Allocations for Class B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses

<p>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 60</p>	<p>Employment Allocations</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	<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
<p>Existing policies</p>	<p>Site Specific Policies DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP/12 Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses • SP/13 Allocations for Class B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses
<p>Analysis</p>	<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 hecates) 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>

b. Pampisford: West of Eastern Counties Leather, London Road (residue) (1.9 hecatres)

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 employment site, and does not warrant consideration for alternative uses.

c. The former Bayer Crop Science site at Hauxton as part of a mixed-use redevelopment.

The site was allocated in the Site Specific Policies DPD, and has subsequently been granted outline planning permission for mixed use development.

SP/13 Allocations for Class B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses

a. Over: Norman Way (residue)

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.

b. Papworth Everard: Ermine Street South (residue)

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.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

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 polices.

	<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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<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 for employment?</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Where development is partially complete the sites form the remaining part of existing employment parks (option A). These are largely integral to existing employment developments, minimising any wider impacts on landscape etc. On each of the sites the land is no longer used for agriculture. The Pampisford site is actually on the edge of Sawston, making it relatively accessible by sustainable transport. Over and Papworth sites are on the edge of better served group villages (subject to other options). Their relatively small remaining scale result in minor impacts.</p> <p>Longstanton (option B) is the only site where development has not commenced. The site has been put forward through the 'call for sites', but is not identified as a site option in the Issues and Options Report. Development would have minor negative impacts on the landscape, that could not be fully mitigated. It is relatively close to the village, and also now relatively close to the Northstowe site. It was originally planned to provide mixed use development at Home Farm. The residential elements have now been completed, so the site could support local access to jobs. A further factor is Northstowe has been identified since the original planning of this site, which could provide an alternative source of employment.</p>
Representations Received	<p>A. Support: 22 Object: 2 Comment: 1</p> <p>B. Support: 8 Object: 2 Comment: 2</p> <p>C. Support: 4 Object: 0 Comment: 7</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Existing employment allocations where development is partially complete:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence that they are inappropriate. • The Pampisford site is well related to the Sawston bypass and can provide employment opportunities for both Pampisford and

	<p>Sawston.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from 11 Parish Councils, Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council. • Objection: Employment development must be directed to more sustainable sites than last round of plans. <p>North of Hattons Road Longstanton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from 2 Parish Councils, Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council. • It will come forward in the future, especially given the new guided busway, continuing development of the Home Farm site and Northstowe. • Objection: Over a mile from the guided busway. Employees would probably use their cars. Should be housing. <p>Six additional sites suggested, and tested. Additional potential Employment Allocation identified in Issues and Options 2 at the former Thyssenkrup Plant, Bourn Airfield, Bourn.</p>
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include the existing Employment Allocations in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>There was support for carrying forward unfinished allocations on existing business parks, in order to enable their completion. They do not warrant consideration for other uses.</p> <p>Hattons Road Longstanton, allocated as part of the Home Farm development and previously benefiting from planning permission including reserved matters, has not come forward, but it is near to Northstowe, and relatively near to the Guided Busway.</p> <p>Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal for the four employment sites at Longstanton, Pampisford, Over and Papworth Everard in the 'Employment' section. The sustainability appraisal for the mixed use development at the Bayer CropScience site is included in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites carried forward from the Local Development Framework' section.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy E/3: Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses Policy E/4: Allocations for Class B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses</p>

Policy E/3: Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses and Policy E/4: Allocations for Class B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses (and paragraph 8.17)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 6 Support: 4 Object: 2
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Waste Water infrastructure available to serve the sites (all four sites) • Environment Agency – raised concern regarding location, but subsequently updated comments that issues are capable of mitigation at the planning application stage. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional Site: Sawston – Spicers Estate. Business led development on the existing Spicers employment site, supported by residential enabling development on a site north of Whitefield Way. .
Assessment	<p>The Spicers Site at Sawston is identified as an Established Employment Area in the Countryside on the policies map, which already provides flexibility for future employment development of the site, and is the appropriate designation for the site.</p> <p>The proposal for residential development north of White Field Way was considered as a site option through the Issues and Options process, but rejected as there were other more suitable options available for residential development. This green belt site has a number of constraints, including landscape impact and access. The proposal to make it enabling development for the wider Spicers site is not justified.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Employment Allocation – additional issues

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see also audit trails for Policy E/3: Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses and Policy E/4: Allocations for Class B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses as well as for Policy SS/6: New Village at Bourn Airfield.

<p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2) Issue 2</p> <p>(also addressed by Issues and Options 2012 Issue 60)</p>	<p>Employment Allocations</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	<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
<p>Existing policies</p>	<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
<p>Analysis</p>	<p>The 2012 Issues and Options consultation sought views on whether existing employment allocations should be carried forward into the new plan, and whether there were any other sites that should be allocated in the Local Plan for employment. A total of six new sites were suggested. One site was identified as an option, and five others were rejected. Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal for each of these sites in the 'Employment' section and Appendix 7 includes a site assessment form for each site.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 2a: Do you support or object to the site option at Former Thyssenkrup Plant, Bourn Airfield, Bourn, and Why?</p>
<p>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</p>	<p>Site was subject to assessment using the Site Testing Matrix, in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal which accompanies the Issues and Options 2013 consultation.</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>Support: 10 Object: 4 Comment: 8</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could serve Bourn Airfield new settlement • Should not be used for housing, retain employment" • Remove noisy activities

	<p>OBJECT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated unless part of a new settlement • Fairfield Partnership – Additional land should be allocated north east of Northstowe, as part of long-term mixed use development; • Additional site should be allocated at Fishers Land Orwell, to allow extension of existing employment site; • Additional land should be allocated at Buckingham Business Park.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Allocate the site for redevelopment for alternative employment uses, in association with the Bourn Airfield new settlement. Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal for this site in the 'Employment' section and Appendix 7 includes a site assessment form.</p> <p>The site is currently in employment use. The site has generated noise problems in the past for the nearby residential areas of Highfields Caldecote.</p> <p>The promoters propose that the site can be redeveloped for more compatible employment uses. It provides a particular opportunity as it is well related to the Bourn Airfield site, and could assist in providing employment to a new village.</p> <p>In response to additional sites proposed in representations:</p> <p><u>Fairfield Partnership – Land North West of Cambourne</u></p> <p>The site was assessed through the SHLAA and initial sustainability appraisal as a mixed use development including employment following its submission through the call for sites. The representations indicate an alternative mix of uses on the same footprint, but it remains a mixed use development comprising employment, residential and other uses. This would result in the same significant impacts identified through the SHLAA and SA which led to its rejection, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant historic environment impact • Significant townscape and landscape impacts • Impacts on surrounding villages; • Problems achieving satisfactory connections due to the guided bus; <p>The assessment of these impacts remains sound.</p> <p>The SHLAA identified serious doubts about the deliverability of this site at the same time as the original Northstowe site and the reserve site already allocated. The delivery of those sites alone may extend beyond the plan period to 2031 and delivery rates would not necessarily increase through the allocation of additional land. The</p>

	<p>risk is that delivery rates would remain broadly similar but extending well beyond the end of the plan period and so requiring additional site allocations elsewhere able to deliver housing over the period to 2031.</p> <p>The promoters response has been to alter the mix, to include a larger element of employment during the plan period, and residential after. As Northstowe will continue beyond 2031 the problems could still arise.</p> <p>New employment pre 2031 would be competing directly with the employment integrated with the town. Rather than supporting its sustainability it could undermine it. Land for an additional 5000 jobs is not required, particularly taking into account evidence from the SHMA regarding anticipate jobs growth.</p> <p>Other locations, but Cambourne employment areas are central to a growing village, where further planned development will result in further transport improvements, and the new town at Waterbeach Barracks is also proposed near to the Cambridge Research Park site. The Council has also responded to the findings of the ELR by supporting intensification of uses on the Cambridge Science Park, and the development of a mixed use employment led area around the new Science Park Station. Further allocation is also proposed on Fulbourn Road Cambridge. It has also responded to evidence seeking greater flexibility by proposing removal of selective employment management policies.</p> <p>One of the main focuses of the new settlement was to provide housing for workers in or near to Cambridge, linked by high quality public transport to the City (established by the Structure Plan 2003). The level of planned employment is appropriate to this goal. The employment evidence submitted by the promoter proposes that Northstowe will not deliver, but it fails to take account of higher town centre employment densities. A significant area of additional employment land outside the established site is not needed.</p> <p><u>Fishers Lane, Orwell</u> (see Appendix 7 for site assessment form and Annex B for the sustainability appraisal)</p> <p>There is no case for amending the village framework, as it correctly reflects the built up area of the village in this location.</p> <p>The allocation of land for employment in this location is also not supported. The Employment Land review indicates sufficient land is committed to meet the anticipated jobs growth to 2031. Orwell is a Group Village, with poor public transport (approximately 4 buses</p>
--	--

	<p>to/from Cambridge per day). It would not be a sustainable location for further employment land allocation.</p> <p><u>Buckingway Business Park, Swavesey</u> (see Appendix 7 for site assessment form and Annex B for the sustainability appraisal)</p> <p>The Employment Land Review indicates that sufficient employment land is available to meet needs up to 2031. Around a third of the existing Buckingway site remains undeveloped. The site comprises Greenfield land, poorly located in terms of public transport access, and located some distance from settlements. A further allocation is not necessary, particularly in a location like this.</p> <p>Note: The representation states that a representation proposing a specific site allocation was submitted in 2012. This was not the case.</p> <p><u>Objection to Rejection of Sites</u></p> <p>Site RE2: Sawston Park, Pampisford The scale of the proposal compared with identified need, and the distance from Sawston village centre means that the site was rejected. The representor contends it was too early to draw this conclusion, However, the Council considers it remains sound.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy E/3: Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses Policy E/4: Allocations for Class B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses Policy SS/6: New Village at Bourn Airfield</p>

Policy E/5: Papworth Hospital

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 111	Papworth Hospital site, Papworth Everard
Key evidence	
Existing policies	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 Addenbrooke's. 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 1,000 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</p>

	<p>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 1,000 dwellings, and those anticipated on Papworth West Central. The merits of the site as an option for residential development are addressed separately. 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 reuse of the site, or residential development.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<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.
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Papworth Hospital comprises a previously developed land. Key differences in the appraisal relate to the retention of employment on the site versus the delivery of housing. Retaining employment would maintain access to employment in the local area, with a particular advantage for maintaining medical uses to reflect the existing employment profile. Much of the employment would be lost if it was developed as a residential site, although the proposal submitted to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment includes some non-residential uses e.g. employment, retail and community uses. There would be consequential impacts on the village as a whole as a result of losing a major employer. There are opportunities to improve the site, and its relationship with the historic environment by replacing some of the unattractive modern buildings. It is unclear whether retention of medical uses on the site would hinder this process as their use would be retained. Redevelopment for residential would create particular infrastructure needs, particularly in relation to highway access. A residential use would address noise issues related to the medical uses of the site and the surrounding existing residential areas.
Representations Received	i: Support: 9, Object: 0, Comment: 1 ii: Support: 3, Object: 0, Comment: 1 iii: Support: 4, Object: 1, Comment: 1 Please provide any comments: Support: 0, Object: 0, Comment: 5
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Question 111i</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New uses(s) must be compatible with the character of the village. • Papworth Everard Parish Council state that the relocation of the hospital will be a significant loss of employment and therefore a major new employer is needed, preferably in healthcare, otherwise it will be a challenge to achieve a sustainable future for Papworth. • Expressed order of priorities is correct. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust suggest that the current LDF policy is undeliverable as modern healthcare facilities and major employers are unlikely to be attracted to the site due to its comparative isolation and its constraints, which are key drivers why the existing hospital is relocating. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – development could result in increased access to the woodland which would be damaging and therefore any proposals will need to be subject to a detailed

	<p>assessment to identify impacts and mitigation requirements.</p> <p>Question 111ii</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New uses(s) must be compatible with adjoining residents. • Support use of site for employment as the housing development already taking place will drown what is left of the village. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust suggest that major employers are unlikely to be attracted to the site due to its constraints and proximity of existing residents. <p>Question 111iii</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust suggest that a residential use has the potential to adapt flexibly to the constraints, other potential uses that could be included are: residential and non-residential institutions, community and leisure uses, hotel or small employment uses. Any solution must be sustainable one in economic, environmental and community terms. Wish to engage with the Council to ensure the delivery of a viable and timely alternative use for the site. • Support use of site for housing led development including mixed uses as the site falls within an existing settlement with amenities, facilities and infrastructure. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papworth Everard Parish Council objects to the use of the site for predominantly residential development. • Do not use this medical site for housing.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Continue to include a policy allowing the Papworth Hospital site to be redeveloped and including a sequential approach with the preferred uses being i. healthcare and ii. employment.</p> <p>The consultation responses show that there is most support for the retention of the existing policy and sequential approach. Continuation of the existing policy is supported by Papworth Everard Parish Council as the relocation of the hospital will be a significant loss of employment and without a major new employer in the village, preferably in healthcare, it will be a challenge to achieve a sustainable future for the village.</p> <p>Healthcare provides a breadth of employment opportunities and the hospital employs a large number of local residents from the</p>

	unskilled to highly specialised doctors and therefore the site should remain in employment use, seeking a healthcare user as a preference, in order to maintain the employment balance in the village and achieve the continuance of the mutually beneficial relationship between hospital and village. The loss of employment from the hospital site would have a significant impact on the economy of the village, and the ability of people to find work locally. 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.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/5: Papworth Hospital
Policy E/5: Papworth Hospital (and paragraphs 8.18 to 8.22)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 12 Support: 3 Object: 9
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papworth Everard Parish Council - very important that the housing and employment balance of the village is maintained. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust - Having a framework for redevelopment is helpful, but policy is not coherent. Suggest the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Definition of healthcare imprecise – should be ‘hospitals, nursing homes, residential care homes, clinics and health centres’. ○ Reference to ‘other’ employment uses not compatible with definition of healthcare above. ○ Requirement for 2 year marketing unreasonable as would have to start before policy adopted. ○ Requirement to ‘maintain’ the viability of Papworth Everard is unreasonable. ○ Requirement to ‘Maintain the present setting of Papworth Hall’ should be to sustain and enhance the setting. Reference to the Conservation area in the policy is superfluous. ○ Should be greater flexibility for residential as part of a mixed use scheme.
Assessment	This policy has been carried forward from the adopted Site Specific Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The policy principles have also been tested again

	<p>through the Issues and Options process for the new Local Plan.</p> <p>The policy focuses on maintaining employment uses on the site, and in particular healthcare, reflecting the current job profile. This is important for making the most of existing assets, and maintaining the viability of the village. Changes to make the policy more flexible for residential development are therefore not supported. The marketing requirement is included in the adopted plan, and remains reasonable.</p> <p>Minor changes to the policy are proposed in response to representations, acknowledging the potential to enhance setting of the Hall, and correcting the name of a building referenced in the supporting text.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend Policy E/5 paragraph 3c to read: ‘Maintain and enhance the present setting of Papworth Hall’</p> <p>Amend Para 8.19 to read: ‘The buildings identified include the Bernhard Baron Hospital Building and Princess Hospital Building (both are examples of hospital buildings designed specifically for tuberculosis patients with design features to ensure access to sunlight and fresh air) and the Sims Woodhead Memorial Laboratory Building (Lakeside Lodge).’</p>

Policy E/6: Imperial War Museum at Duxford

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 116	The Imperial War Museum site at Duxford Airfield
Key evidence	
Existing policies	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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</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?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Policy contributes to preservation of historic assets, whilst acknowledging the role of the museum as a tourist attraction. Given the importance of the asset it is considered to have potential for significant positive impact. Supporting continued use of this successful tourist attraction also have positive implications for the economic objectives.
Representations Received	Support: 28, Object: 2, Comment: 3
Key Issues from Representations	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for continuation of the existing policy as the policy appears to be working and the site is an internationally important museum and significant historical asset that should be preserved and supported. • Maintain the policy but need to remember it is an operational civil airfield that provides income and employment. • Impacts on local communities of any additional activities need to be considered. Flying should be limited to aircraft movements directly related to the museum - large amounts of noise on a few days where there are Air Displays can be accepted. • Supported by 12 Parish Councils. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imperial War Museum proposes a more flexible policy to ensure the long term financial viability of the site and make good use of assets by allowing a broader use of the site for Imperial War Museum specific activities, third party uses, ancillary uses and other appropriate uses to maximise income and create sustainability.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Continue to include a policy that allows the Imperial War Museum at Duxford to be treated as a special case given to its national significance, but amend the existing adopted policy to be more flexible on the uses that will be permitted. The policy must ensure that details of projected increases in noise are provided with all proposals which would lead to an increase in commercial or flying activity.</p> <p>There is support for the continuation of the existing policy and amending the policy to include more flexibility over the uses that would be permitted on the site will ensure that the vitality and sustainability of the site is assured and the Imperial War Museum can make good use of their assets.</p>

Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/6: Imperial War Museum at Duxford
Policy E/6: Imperial War Museum at Duxford (and paragraphs 8.23 to 8.24)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 2 Object: 6
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ickleton Society - IWM Duxford is a major asset of significant importance to our district. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IWM Duxford - pleased to note and give support to the proposal for a more flexible and appropriate policy for IWM Duxford, but suggest paragraph 8.24 is included in the main policy. • English Heritage – Reference to a ‘special case’ should be clarified. The significance of the site should be weighed appropriately in considering any proposals for development. Should include reference in policy to address their protection.
Assessment	<p>Paragraph 8.24 provides a context for the special case applied to the museum by the policy due to its national significance. It highlights that it is a sensitive site on the edge of the Cambridge Green Belt. It is reasonable to provide this context in the supporting text rather than the policy, but it is agreed that reference to the national importance should be added to the policy.</p> <p>The museum is in a Conservation Area and includes a significant number of Listed Buildings. The impact of proposals on these heritage assets would need to be considered, in accordance with Policy NH/14. However, it is acknowledged that this important heritage role could be highlighted in the plan.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend Policy E/6 paragraph 1 to read: ‘The Imperial War Museum site at Duxford Airfield <u>is of national significance, and</u> will be treated as a special case as a museum which is a major tourist / visitor attraction, educational and commercial facility.’</p> <p>Amend Policy E/6 paragraph 2 to read: ‘Proposals will be considered with regard to the particular needs</p>

and opportunities of the site and any proposals involving the use of the estate and its facilities for museum uses or non-museum uses must be **complementary** ~~complimentary~~ to the character, vitality and sustainability of the site as a branch of the Imperial War Museum.'

Amend first sentence of paragraph 8.23 to read:

'The Imperial War Museum Duxford (**IWM Duxford** ~~IWMD~~) is an integral element of the multi branch Imperial War Museums and is a major tourist / visitor attraction, educational and commercial facility based on a long established airfield.'

Add additional text after 5th sentence of 8.23 as follows:

Duxford is regarded as the finest and best-preserved example of a fighter base representative of the period up to 1945 in Britain, with an exceptionally complete group of First World War technical buildings in addition to technical and domestic buildings typical of both inter-war Expansion Periods of the RAF. It also has important associations with the Battle of Britain and the American fighter support for the Eighth Air Force. Development proposals will need to consider the impact on this important heritage asset, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy NH/14.'

Policy E/7: Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals

Issues and Options 2012 Chapter 13 – Fulbourn & Ida Darwin Hospitals	Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals Site
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Site Specific Policies DPD: Policy SP/9 Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals
Analysis	<p>A policy allowing the redevelopment of the Ida Darwin Hospital and Fulbourn Hospital sites for residential development and new mental health facilities was originally included in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document (adopted January 2010).</p> <p>Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Mental Health Foundation Trust who own and operate both sites intend to rationalise health care provision on the sites, including relocating some existing uses from the Ida Darwin site to the Fulbourn Hospital site. They will no longer require the majority of buildings on the Ida Darwin site. It is anticipated that the Ida Darwin site could deliver 250 to 275 dwellings, although the total would depend on any buildings that would remain on the Ida Darwin site, and the amount of additional healthcare development required on the Fulbourn Hospital site. Discussions relating to the masterplanning of the site are in progress.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: None. The policy should be carried forward into the new Local Plan and remain until the development has been completed. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools,</p>

	<p>doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Carry forward the existing policy into the new Local Plan but remove the references to Policy GB/4 of the Development Control Policies DPD which designated the site as a major developed site in the Green Belt. The draft Local Plan does not include a policy for major developed sites in the Green Belt as this is covered by the National Planning Policy Framework. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector. Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal for this site in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites carried forward from the Local Development Framework' section.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	<p>Policy E/7: Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals</p>
<p>Policy E/7: Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals (and paragraphs 8.25 to 8.36)</p>	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 5 Support: 1 Object: 4</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England - welcome specific reference to landscape, biodiversity and GI requirements. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn Parish Council - should make specific cross-reference to proposed policy NH/9 in particular to maintaining existing height and openness in any redevelopment. • Risk of merging Fulbourn with Cherry Hinton. Expand the green wedge further east.
Assessment	<p>The policy approach reflects the adopted Site Specific Policies DPD, which was tested at examination, and has been considered again through the Issues and Options process or the new Local Plan. The redevelopment of the Ida Darwin site and the creation of a green wedge will add the openness of the Green Belt. The exact width will need to be determined through the development brief, and it would not be appropriate for the plan to include a specific scale. The plan avoids general cross referencing to potentially relevant policies, as it should be read as a whole.</p>

	As the policy is focused on enabling residential development, a minor change is proposed to relocate it to the housing chapter of the plan.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	Minor change Move policy E/7 and supporting text (8.25 to 8.36) to Chapter 7 (Delivering High Quality Homes), and place after paragraph 7.13.

Policy E/8: Mixed-Use Development in Histon & Impington Station Area

Note: For audit trail for Issues and Options 2012 see audit trail within Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy – Issue 7 Localism and Relationship with Neighbourhood Development Plans.

See also the audit trail for Development Options in Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy

Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2) Issue 4	Parish Council Proposal for ‘Station’, Histon and Impington
Key evidence	
Existing policies	None
Analysis	<p>The Council received a proposal from Histon and Impington Parish Council as part of the proposal that the Local Plan includes community initiatives that local parish councils would otherwise have wished to put in a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Histon and Impington Parish Council is seeking to proactively design a special area in Histon and Impington around the former station, which is now a stop on the Guided Busway. The proposal is to use this key area to make significant use of the Busway in order to encourage sensitive redevelopment of this area and stimulate commercial activity and to encourage local employment which has recently declined.</p> <p>Their vision is that ‘Station’ will form a vibrant ‘gateway’ to the community and should be mixed development of housing, businesses, private and public sector space and community amenities, with simple cafes and takeaways to more sophisticated restaurants and wine bars, along with open space and street art.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools,</p>

	<p>doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 4: Do you support or object to the proposal by Histon and Impington Parish Council for 'Station' in Histon and Impington and why?</p> <p>Please provide comments.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>ton and Impington Parish Council is seeking to proactively design a special area in the Histon and Impington settlement to regenerate the area around the former station, which is now a stop on the Guided Busway. The sustainability appraisal identifies the sustainability of the location in terms of access to public transport, and the opportunities provided by the previously developed sites within the identified area. Particular issues to consider would include the relationship with the existing village centre.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Support: 74, Object: 13, Comment: 62</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered response to identified need for this community; • We need to make Station area of Impington centre of our community providing amenities that can be enjoyed by residents and visitors alike; • Bring back character to the area; • Positive that included business premises and opportunity for employment within proposal; • Imbalance of services in village as most of amenities are in Histon, proposal would help to redress balance; • Should be a mixed development with residential and business use taking advantage of Guided Bus; • Must not threaten viability of existing shops; • Would like part of area retained as open space as community amenity, possibly used as regular farmers' market; • It has history as commercial land it also deserves revival. Cafe is a delusion but late night shop feasible; • More shops and restaurants would be useful; • Guided bus stop currently isolated after dark, should enhance use of the guided bus; • Would stimulate the economy, and invigorate the area; • Triangle of land to East of New Road and West of Bridge Road is well wooded and should be retained and designated as a public open space; • Enables use of brownfield site; • Support the Parish Council's idea to do something creative;

- Need to include parking as not everyone will use guided bus;
- Guided Busway provides good access, use should be maximised;
- Good idea provided it will not harm residents of this quiet area;
- SCDC and RIBA should organise a design competition to generate ideas;
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** - Support this initiative by the Parish Council to encourage redevelopment of this area to improve its appearance and return some commercial uses to the area;
- **Caldecote Parish Council; Foxton Parish Council, Oakington and Westwick Parish Council, Orwell Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Shepreth Parish Council, Teversham Parish Council, Comberton Parish Council, Waterbeach Parish Council** - Support;
- **Histon and Impington Parish Council** - Only negative comments arose from misunderstanding that whole of PC1 area was being proposed for development. Not the intention of the Parish Council which thought it useful to delineate the area that would be directly affected by the requested site specific policies on the three nominated sites within the PC1 area. Many adverse comments to proposal to replace warehouse employment site (ref H2) with residential development. Too valuable a keystone site within the gateway area to the settlement that to use for pure residential development was a shameful waste of site.

OBJECTIONS:

- The former Bishops Site is suitable to support residential function only. There is real opportunity to deliver a residential scheme on the site in the short-term, a mixed use proposal would compromise the opportunity to deliver a meaningful residential solution, and potentially frustrate the opportunity to redevelop the site. The owners have evaluated mixed use potential for the site and concluded that there is no such option which lends itself at all suitable. The former Bishops site should therefore be removed from the mixed use zone;
- Infrastructure cannot cope e.g. schools, doctors.
- What about a car park for the guided bus?
- Most people are not at the stop long enough for new facilities there is already plenty of housing and employment nearby;
- Station house is of great character and I cannot see the need for such an ambitious proposal;
- Housing (max 10) acceptable. Rest will detract from 'village' atmosphere enough already in Vision park;
- There are too many places to eat competing with each other;
- Concern about loss of Green Belt and farmland around villages;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The villages are already almost Cambridge. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local people should decide; • Need more information on the scope of the project; • Seems to suggest quite a large development; • Not more housing; • Consider impact on infrastructure; • Need to consider traffic impact; • The Bishops site is an eyesore and needs redevelopment; • Hope that local residents would be given the opportunity to have input into the design of the area; • Histon does not need to become a tourist attraction; • No objection provided the A14 is improved; • I agree that this area could do with 'tidying up' but with regard to it being a gateway, I have my doubts. And as for restaurants and cafes, just how many do you think this area could support. There is already a pub there; • Will it be economically viable? • What is really needed is a car park for users of the guided bus; • Not everyone can walk there - it is a very long way from the other end of the village; • Cannot see how the need for large parking spaces would be dealt with without spoiling the area; • Will only make small contribution to overall dwellings requirement; • Many villages have been involved in Community plans supported by ACRE. These plans should be incorporated into your big plan, ensuring that all aspects of sustainability (economic, resource use, biodiversity and social aspects) are integrated in the plan. • What about places that don't have anything such as Cambourne; • Girton Parish Council – Development around the guided bus felt to be more appropriate to a town rather than a village; • Natural England – No objection to the proposal
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include a policy in the Local Plan for mixed-use development in the 'Station' area of Histon and Impington. The policy will require developers to demonstrate that they will address the Parish Council objectives for the redevelopment of the area, with sensitively designed development that integrates well and respects the character of the area, and does not undermine the vitality and viability of the existing village centre.</p> <p>This proposal is consistent with the Local Plan, and appears to have strong local support.</p> <p>Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a</p>

	sustainability appraisal for this proposal in the 'Parish Council Proposals' section.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/8: Mixed-use Development in Histon and Impington Station area
Policy E/8: Mixed-Use Development in Histon & Impington Station Area (and paragraphs 8.37 to 8.43)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 18 Support: 13 Object: 5
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Histon and Impington Parish Council - Significant support from majority of residents. Mixed use has been misinterpreted by some, and vision offers greater flexibility. Evidence that guided bus has increased footfall in the area. • Worthwhile, as long as it is led by the local Parish Council for villagers and to attract visitors passing through from Cambridge and St Ives. • Has potential to benefit area, but must not impact on retail in High Street. • Need firm decision making to implement vision for mixed use. • Regarding a supplementary Planning Document, Consultation will need to be undertaken with property owners to ensure their future plans are addressed. Need flexibility rather than fixed use allocations. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal not subjected to full and proper evaluation before being promoted. No clear support from land owners. No impact assessment on village centre. No evidence of additional need for retail uses. Not appropriate to indicate the area as a destination. Too restrictive. Local Plan should not be seen as an alternative to a Neighbourhood Plan. • Welcome the intent, but needs to explain costs / viability, and how future benefits will be accrued if existing businesses are to review their accommodation. Less pre-occupation with small specialist shops and leisure outlets as they could not be viable. • Needs to be flexible and not prejudice existing businesses. • Reality is that redevelopment will need to be led by residential development and the proposed allocation fails to recognise the

	<p>desirable benefits of this highly sustainable location for residential development or the impact on the remainder of the village of a second retail centre. There is not support from the principle landowners and there has been no discussion with the key stakeholders.</p>
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>This policy is a Parish led proposal, reflecting the community led approach to the local plan. It was initiated by the Parish Council, and was supported by the majority of respondents to the proposal at the issues and options consultation. National Planning Practice Guidance highlights that Communities may decide that they could achieve the outcomes they want to see through planning routes outside a neighbourhood plan, such as incorporating their proposals for the neighbourhood into the Local Plan. Although explained in the audit trail and through the issues and options process, a reference to this in the supporting text would help clarify the origin of the policy.</p> <p>The policy seeks to achieve mixed use development at this new transport interchange. It provides a high degree of flexibility, so that proposals can be tailored to the circumstances of individual sites. Due to this flexibility it is challenging to provide specific viability assessment in advance of individual planning applications.</p> <p>The policy does not seek that the station area challenges the village centre as a destination, and given the scale of land in this area, it is difficult to see how creation of mixed use development in this area would significantly impact on viability of the village centre. It seeks to ensure this area retains a mixed use character which benefits the village.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Add additional paragraph before 8.37: <u>'This policy is a Parish Council led proposal, reflecting the community led approach to the local plan, enabling it to address local issues without the need for a neighbourhood plan. It was subject to consultation during plan making and received clear support.'</u></p>

Policy E/9: Promotion of Clusters

Issues and Options 2012 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	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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 63: Should the plan continue to include a policy supporting the development of clusters?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Clear focus of the option is to help to facilitate development and support the Cambridge area as an internationally recognised high tech centre. Potential for significant positive impacts on the achievement of economic objectives are therefore identified.
Representations Received	Support: 33 Object: 2 Comment: 4
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential to the on-going success of Cambs • Need to also support supporting services • To support protection and availability of sites for cluster development • The concentration (in the form of a mini-cluster) of biotechnology businesses at Granta Park/TWI has itself brought significant

	<p>benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The promotion of clusters is a planning policy approach that complements the Wellcome Trust Genome Campus Development Plan. • Support is particularly important given the growing evidence that the Cambridge Cluster has lost momentum as highlighted within the SQW Cambridge Cluster at 50 Report amongst others. • Should not be at the expense of also encouraging other business and employment opportunities. • Support from 10 Parish Councils, and Cambridgeshire County Council <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPRE – clusters should be contained within overall employment policy
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy supporting the development of Clusters in the Local Plan.</p> <p>A specific policy is needed to reflect the needs of cluster related firms, as highlighted by the Council's Economic Development Strategy.</p> <p>The policy highlights that strategic employment sites, including on the northern fringe of Cambridge, north west Cambridge, and Northstowe, offer specific opportunities to deliver the variety of premises, including for start-ups, that are needed to support cluster development.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/9: Promotion of Clusters
Policy E/9: Promotion of Clusters (and paragraphs 8.44 to 8.48)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 11</p> <p>Support: 5</p> <p>Object: 6</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimous agreement by all the businesses consulted on the Cambridge PPF 2030 Vision that location in clusters with like-minded companies was essential for their success. • The concentration (in the form of a mini-cluster) of businesses at Granta Park/TWI has itself brought significant benefits. • This policy will proactively drive and support the sustainable economic development of existing business and help attract new businesses to South Cambridgeshire. • Existing policy ET/1 (Development Control Policies DPD) is very

	<p>restrictive, failing to recognise high value manufacturing, high tech headquarters, and support services can help reinforce development of high-technology clusters.</p> <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council, Calcedote Parish Council - Cambourne should be included as a site suited to cluster development. • Clusters should be located only where there is adequate provision of public transport or where new public transport is planned. • The promotion of clusters requires more than the identification of additional employment land in appropriate locations. It is important that the plan recognises the importance of maintaining the character of Cambridge and providing sufficient and accessible supporting development, including new housing, to support the jobs target and the creation of effective clusters in and on the edge of the City. • Paragraph 8.48 should be deleted because it undermines a number of key policies in the NPPF, including planning positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters and the provision of sustainable economic development generally. • The supporting text to Policy E/9 should recognise the potential need for new high technology businesses to be located close to existing centres of excellence where linkages and collaborative work can be facilitated. • Object to the non-allocation of the Cambridge South site for an 85,000 sq m R&D led mixed use development. Sustainable location, would benefit the economy, provide a new focus for R&D south of the City.
Assessment	<p>A number of the issues raised by objectors are addressed by the wider strategy of the Local Plan, in particular in the spatial strategy chapter, and the transport and infrastructure chapter.</p> <p>Paragraph 2 of the policy highlights strategic employment sites with particular opportunities for new cluster development. There are other locations which will continue to contribute to the development of clusters, but due to the number not all are specifically referenced. The policy maintains general support for cluster development.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.48 highlights the importance of monitoring the impact of removal of selective management policies that were part of previous plans. This is a significant policy change and it is important the impacts are monitored. This is a sound element of the plan.</p> <p>Additional supporting text is not required, as the policy provides</p>

	<p>appropriate support for cluster development, and recognises the benefits of colocation.</p> <p>Sufficient employment land is available for cluster development, and the development strategy is the most appropriate solution for the district. The allocation proposal on the South of Cambridge is addressed elsewhere.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Local Development Order

No policy included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan

Issues and Options 2012 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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.
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>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Local Development Orders have the potential to support achievement of the economic objectives. Scale of the impact would depend on the nature of the site, and whether it has a direct impact on its delivery and success. Conditions may be required as part of the LDO, in order to ensure potential for negative impacts on a range of other objectives were appropriately addressed.
Representations Received	Support: 7 Object: 14 Comment: 1

Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would help businesses set up more quickly, and encourage employment development. • Cambourne Parish Council suggested Cambourne Business Park. <p>OBJECT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern with loss of planning controls. • Cambridge City Council is concerned with potential impacts on the setting of the City.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>This is not a matter for the Local Plan, as an LDO would be established through a separate process.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	<p>No policy.</p>

Policy E/10: Shared Social Spaces in Employment Areas

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 64	Shared social spaces as part of employment areas
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	
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 Plan could include a policy to promote shared social spaces on employment parks, such as cafes, restaurants, or social hubs, or not include a policy.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 64: Should the Local plan seek shared social spaces on or near employment parks?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Inclusion of social spaces in employment areas could support their development and vitality, and depending on the facility provide wider benefits, such as to health of workers.
Representations Received	Support:24 Object: 5 Comment: 3
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for seeking shared social spaces in or nearer employment parks.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Granta Park is an example of what can be achieved. • If possible facilities should also be available to general public. • Support from 10 Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should support but not be incumbent on employers to provide. • No need for a policy.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy supporting the development of shared social spaces on employment parks.</p> <p>There is general support for policy which would enable shared social spaces to enhance business and employment areas. The policy includes criteria to ensure employment uses of sites are not prejudiced, and they are compatible with surrounding uses, and that they are of an appropriate scale.</p> <p>The policy enables provision, rather than requires, as provision may not be necessary or appropriate for all sites.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/10: Shared Social Spaces in Employment Areas
Policy E/10: Shared Social Spaces in Employment Areas (and paragraphs 8.49 to 8.50)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Support: 1 Object: 1
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Granta Park/TWI benefits from shared social spaces. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The words 'small-scale' should be replaced with 'appropriately scaled'. Whilst uses should be ancillary to business, they should be appropriate to meet needs.
Assessment	It is agreed that a change would make the policy more flexible to meet the needs in different scales of employment areas. There are sufficient controls in the other elements of the policy to ensure facilities are ancillary to the business uses and focus on meeting needs of the business park only.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend first part of Policy E/10 to read: '<u>Appropriately scaled</u> Small-scale-leisure, eating and social hub facilities will be permitted in business parks and employment areas where.'</p>

Policy E/11: Large Scale Warehousing and Distribution Centres

Issues and Options 2012 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	<p>Development Control Policies DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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</p>

maintained a viable business operation locally.

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.

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.

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 best mix of policy benefits and costs.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

Alternatives to keep or remove the policy, or to keep or amend parts of the policy.

The review of the Local Plan should consider whether selective management of the economy as a policy approach should be continued, amended, or discontinued.

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.

Maintaining the policy on selected high technology business parks

	<p>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>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. ii. Retain the policy in its current form for specified areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Science Park • Granta Park • Babraham Institute • Wellcome Trust • Melbourn Science Park • North West Cambridge (University) iii. Amend the policy to allow for large scale, high value manufacturing and high tech headquarters to locate to South Cambridgeshire. iv. Remove the policy apart from the restriction on large-scale warehousing and distribution. v. Remove the policy entirely.

<p>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</p>	<p>of the options is the measures that could be put in place to control the types of employment development permitted in the district. It is difficult to measure the scale of the impact of the selective management policy, although the local economy has developed successfully with the policy in place, it is not clear how it would have developed without it. Overall, a policy which reserves employment land to uses that need to be in the area would minimise use of land and resources. There is some evidence that the current policy may hold back development of the high tech economy, and therefore permitting greater flexibility could have a more positive economic impact.</p> <p>Impacts identified focus on the economic objectives, but the scores reflect the uncertainty regarding the scale of impact. Removal of the policy (option v) could have implications for warehousing and distribution, which is land intensive and could have transport implications, but the scale would depend on whether such firms chose to locate in the district, and the controls applied by other options.</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>i. Support:17 Object: 0 Comment: 1 ii. Support: 9 Object: 2 Comment: 1 iii. Support:4 Object: 1 Comment: 4 iv. Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 0 v. Support: 3 Object: 3 Comment: 0</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>Comments Received:</p> <p>i. Retain the current policy approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from 6 Parish Councils • Has been successful in supporting development of the area. • Other parts of the UK need employment more than the Cambridge area and will be keen to take employment of a type unsuitable for this region. <p>ii. Retain the policy in its current form for specified areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from 7 Parish Councils • Wellcome Trust: important the Local Plan continues its policy approach of support for high tech research and development. Wording of policy should acknowledge the contribution of complementary development, such as information technology and conference and training programmes. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that it could place sites at competitive disadvantage. • TWI (Granta Park) - The existing policy framework is overly restrictive, failing to recognise that high value manufacturing, high tech headquarters, and importantly support services can help reinforce the development of high-technology clusters. The nature of B1 uses is evolving, with a merging of traditional R&D uses and B1(a) Offices, and that the provision and size of

	<p>offices should not be unduly restricted. The user restriction should permit greater flexibility and allow activities which are not in themselves high technology, but help foster their growth and development. This could include for example business services, financial and management services patent agents and specialist manufacturing and accessibly. the current limitations on occupancy need to be relaxed to help maximise and foster the successful and continued development of the park.</p> <p>iii. Amend the policy to allow for large scale, high value manufacturing and high tech headquarters</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council - support an amendment of policies to allow for greater flexibility • Support from 3 Parish Councils <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need maximum restriction of further industry <p>iv. Remove the policy apart from the restriction on large-scale Warehousing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need maximum restriction of further industry <p>v. Remove the policy entirely</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So that other types of employment are not discouraged from the Cambridge area. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need restrictions on large scale warehousing. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to facilitate businesses that need Cambridge location, and discourage those that can locate elsewhere. • An example of what should not be done are the recent plans for the Cambridge Research Park on the A10. Specifically granting planning for 'industrial' buildings is a wasted opportunity to keep the faith with the strength of Cambridge.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Do not include a policy on selective management of employment in the Local Plan, but include a policy restricting large scale warehousing and distribution centres.</p> <p>Recent evidence in the Employment Land Review, building on the Cambridge Cluster at 50 study, suggests that the high tech cluster is maturing. Greater flexibility is needed to support its</p>

	<p>diversification, to enable associated high tech manufacturing and headquarters functions. A significant element of future growth in the district is expected to come from other office sectors, which could be restricted by previous policies.</p> <p>A high number of business start-ups and failures is one of the characteristics of the Cambridge high tech sector and there is a risk that a more flexible policy could affect the future of the sector, by increasing competition for land and buildings, and increasing rents. However, given the amount of employment land is available, and the policy supporting clusters seeks to deliver and land buildings suitable for their future development. Concerns about the impact of development can be addressed by other policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>On balance the evidence suggests the benefits of removing the policy currently outweigh the costs. It will be absolutely vital that the impact on the district economy, and particular the high technology research & development clusters, is closely monitored, and a policy reinstated through plan review if evidence indicates harmful impacts.</p> <p>The only element of the Selective Management of Employment policies for the Cambridge area which warrants retention is the restriction on large scale warehousing and distribution centres. These uses require a large land area, but generate relatively low numbers of jobs. They could quickly reduce the available land supply, and increase pressure on transport networks, which could harm the continued prosperity of the high technology clusters.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/11: Large Scale Warehousing and Distribution Centres
Policy E/11: Large Scale Warehousing and Distribution Centres (and paragraph 8.51)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Support: 0 Object: 2
Main Issues	Object <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council, Caldecote Parish Council - applications for Large Scale Warehousing and Distribution Centres should be taken on a case by case basis with a view to promoting sustainability by providing alternative employment.

Assessment	These uses require a large land area, but generate relatively low numbers of jobs. They could quickly reduce the available land supply, and increase pressure on transport networks. The policy remains a sound element of the plan.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/12: New Employment Development in Villages

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 67	New Employment Development in Villages
Key evidence	
Existing policies	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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their</p>

	<p>location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</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> <p>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.</p> <p>ii. A more flexible approach that development should be in keeping with the category, character, function and of the settlement.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Both options support delivery of appropriately scaled employment in villages. This scores positively for efficient use of land, and the range of potential employment opportunities is reflected in potential for significant positive impacts on achievement of the economic objectives. It could also support sustainable transport, although there is some uncertainty, as delivery of jobs in villages may allow people to work where they live, but it may also encourage travel to villages where they may not have good public transport services. The options make a positive contribution to the inequalities objective, as supporting rural employment may contribute to addressing rurality issues identified in the Scoping Report, particularly for people who do not have access to a car, or need access to local jobs due to childcare commitments for example. The difference in the options is a strict limit in scale versus a site by site approach reflecting scale character and function of the villages. A single scale limit (option i) may not be appropriate to all villages, therefore its removal could better support economic growth, but the scale of difference in impact is unclear. There is greater uncertainty on the impact on the landscape and townscape objective without the specific scale criteria (option ii), but it refers to development being in keeping with scale and character.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i: Support: 18 Object: 4 Comment: 1 ii: Support: 31 Object: 1 Comment: 2</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>OPTION i:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needed to give clarity and certainty to local people and developers about what is not acceptable • Traffic generated from any development is a concern to neighbouring properties. Smaller developments should create less of a problem with this.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To allow larger employment developments within existing villages would have a severe impact of the infrastructure, utilities, services and facilities currently available to those villages • The spacing already considered in your plan for employment development is large for a village. • Support retention of the existing restrictions because otherwise there is likely to be an economically-driven expansion in local industry with yet further demands on local housing. • Support from 6 Parish Councils <p>OPTION ii: SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies have proven to be insufficiently flexible and may have discouraged employment which might have been appropriate but just fell the wrong side of the policy limitations. • Policies relating to economic development should be flexible to ensure development comes forward. Strict policies will simply discourage employment within the rural area which will only harm the sustainability of these places • In order to allow businesses to grow and thrive in the difficult time we now have but for the future, current policies will need to be relaxed. • Restricting new employment development to specific uses and sizes does not provide the encouragement to developers to invest in employment schemes in villages. • Each application should be considered on its merits, particularly in the context of the circumstances prevailing at the time of submission and the overall makeup of the village and its immediate surroundings. • All restrictions should be removed with a more flexible approach which actively encourages all forms and scales of development within the villages, particularly those with good public transport links. • Support from 12 Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include a policy in the Local Plan which supports employment development in villages which is in keeping with the category, character and function of the settlement.</p> <p>Thresholds provide certainty regarding scale, restricting large scale development in rural areas, but the thresholds have proven insufficiently flexible to deal with the variety of sites within the villages of the district. There is concern that flexibility will mean impacts are not properly considered, but the Local Plan will be read as a whole, and other policies will apply to address general issues such as traffic and environmental impact.</p>

Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/12: New Employment Development in Villages
Policy E/12: New Employment Development in Villages (and paragraph 8.52)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 3 Support: 0 Object: 3
Main Issues	Object <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council - weakens the existing LDF policy (ET/4) by removing all size restrictions. It also does not define any local employment criteria. • Concerned that the term "very small scale" requires further definition and clarification to provide better guidance for would-be developers and parish councils.
Assessment	Thresholds provide certainty regarding scale, restricting large scale development in rural areas, but the thresholds have proven insufficiently flexible to deal with the variety of sites within the villages of the district. There is concern that flexibility will mean impacts are not properly considered, but the Local Plan will be read as a whole, and other policies will apply to address general issues such as traffic and environmental impact.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/13: New Employment Development on the Edges of Villages

Issues and Options 2012 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 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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>

	Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 68:</p> <p>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>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Flexibility to utilise previously developed land on the edge of and very close to villages (option Ai) would support land objectives, and further contribute to the economic objectives identified in issue 66. Impact on transport objectives is uncertain, as sites could be less accessible than more central sites in villages, but the options aim for sites that remain accessible by means other than the car.</p> <p>Permitting use of greenfield land adjoining better served villages (option Aii) would have negative impact on the land objective. The more flexible option could further enable economic development. Controls identified on other options will be important to secure other objectives, such as biodiversity and landscape and townscape, as allowing further development on the edges of villages has potential for negative impact.</p> <p>Requiring proposals to demonstrate there is no site available in the village (option B) could provide even greater support for the land objective, and sustainable transport. It could also support retention of existing employment sites, identified in issue 71.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Ai: Support: 34 Object: 4 Comment: 3</p> <p>Aii: Support: 8 Object: 8 Comment: 1</p> <p>B: Support: 20 Object: 2 Comment: 7 (13 of the supports also supported i above, 2 supported ii)</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>OPTION i:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility is again the key. Employment development in the rural area aids sustainability and therefore should be encouraged. • Promoting business and employment in rural villages is vital for the success and sustainability of local communities

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment development should not encroach on green-field land. Parish councils should be able to divert building onto previously developed land. • Allow such development only if it can be shown to be of a size and character not detrimental to the village. • Support from 15 Parish Councils. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All employment development proposals should be judged upon their individual circumstances and merits. <p>OPTION ii:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan should provide the flexibility to also utilise greenfield land where logically related to the built form of a Rural and Minor Rural Centre, which would benefit the local economy through appropriate forms of development. • Flexibility is again the key. Employment development in the rural area aids sustainability and therefore should be encouraged. • Support from 2 Parish Councils <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenfield land should only be developed as a last resort, either for housing or business. This option will open the possibility for business use to creep beyond village frameworks. • All employment development proposals should be judged upon their individual circumstances and merits. • Unsustainable as it will lead to sprawl and cumulative impact • Objection from 1 Parish Council <p>OPTION B:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be in-place ensure that existing employment uses are not relocated to the edge of a settlement so as to liberate residential development land. • Consideration should be made not only of existing buildings but also of existing permissions for development not enacted/yet undeveloped. • Developments, whether they be for employment or residential, should not be considered unless appropriate research has been carried out and the need ascertained that such premises are in fact required in the area. • Support from 13 Parish Councils (of which 10 also supported option i)
--	--

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals for employment provision on the edge of existing settlements should be considered on their own merits without requirement to consider the merits of other locations which may or may not be being brought forward for development at the same time. The presumption is that applicants have looked and cannot find anything. Or what is available is unsuitable. Demonstrating a negative in respect of sites and buildings is a waste of time and resources. If there were suitable or more economic buildings available, then it is likely they would have been used.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include a policy enabling employment development on the edges of villages, with appropriate criteria to address adverse impacts.</p> <p>The policy would enable the re-use of previously developed land, but where this is not possible would enable the use of greenfield land in appropriate circumstances. This additional flexibility will help support the rural economy, and provide additional flexibility to support the needs of businesses.</p> <p>Proposed criteria include that sites are logically related to the settlement, would not have an adverse impact on character and appearance, in particular the village edge. This is to ensure that village character is appropriately protected.</p> <p>It is reasonable to seek to ensure alternatives have been fully explored before development on greenfield land on the edges of villages is considered.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy E/13: New Employment Development on the Edge of Villages</p>
<p>Policy E/13: New Employment Development on the Edges of Villages (and paragraph 8.53)</p>	
<p>Proposed Submission Representations Received</p>	<p>Total: 9 Support: 4 Object: 5</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permissive towards new employment uses adjoining or close to development frameworks and expressly prioritises previously developed land. Support elements e and f as will protect rural nature of South Cambs. Support subject to good design.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to green belt policy is fundamental. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourn Parish Council - it will remove any protection offered by the village framework with respect to business development (as opposed to housing development). Sections a and b do not provide a mechanism for a formal consultation process involving the applicant, SCDC and PC. Amend to remove the onerous requirements that prevent existing established businesses in villages from expanding (development framework at Volac International site Fishers Lane Orwell should be amended)
Assessment	<p>The policy sets a reasonable balance between flexibility and control of development. Parish Councils are already be consulted through the planning application process.</p> <p>The Fishers Lane Orwell site was considered through the issues and options process, and rejected. The framework is correctly drawn in this location, and there is no need for an employment allocation at a group village. Any proposals can be considered through the planning application process.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/14: Loss of Employment Land to Non Employment Uses

<p>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 72</p>	<p>Retention of Employment Sites</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	<p>Annual Monitoring Report</p>
<p>Existing policies</p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD: ET/6 Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses</p>
<p>Analysis</p>	<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>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<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 should be permitted?</p>
<p>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</p>	<p>Including a policy protecting village employment sites would benefit maintenance of mixed communities, by promoting retention of employment sites in villages. The Scoping Report identified a gradual loss of employment land and buildings occurring even with the policy. If no policy were included this rate could increase. Many settlements have relatively low level of jobs to economically active people, meaning high levels of out commuting is a necessity. If this balance was to worsen it would reduce access to local jobs further. Positive impact has been identified on the redressing inequalities objectives, as supporting retention of local jobs would help address rurality issues. However, it reduces flexibility regarding reuse of employment sites, and could impact on delivery of housing, although it is the wider role of the plan to meet housing needs.</p>

	<p>Widening to encompass land on the edges of villages (option ii) could make the policy more effective where there is employment located on the edge of a village, therefore having a marginally greater impact on the economy objectives.</p> <p>Changing the tests is a largely operational issue, proposed to make the policy more effective without altering its overall aim.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Ai. Support: 8 Object: 1 Comment: 5 Aii. Support: 20 Object: 0 Comment: 2 B: Support: 25 Object: 8 Comment: 5</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Option i</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan must continue to resist the loss of employment land to alternative uses both in villages, and village edges. • One year's marketing does not seem long in this economic climate. • Support from 8 Parish Councils <p>Option ii</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan must continue to resist the loss of employment land to alternative uses both in villages, and village edges. • Settlements without or with diminishing employment opportunities can become unattractive places to live, certainly add to transport issues, and can be 'storing-up' future social problems. Yes, there has already been too much employment land lost within villages. • You are short of employment sites, should consider this expanded remit. • Support from 11 Parish Councils <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned the current policy provides no recognition that previously developed land, including under-utilised employment sites on the edge of Rural Centres (or other villages) that are relatively close to services and facilities, and make only a limited contribution to local employment, could have a significant role to play in the Development Strategy. • A flexible approach to the provision of employment provision in and adjoining villages should be taken to enable the relevant circumstances pertaining at the time of any application to be taken into consideration. • If there are sites with empty offices and the demand is such that these sites are likely to remain empty, they should be considered for housing development, before greenfield sites are considered.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land in our villages should be used for the most appropriate uses at the time. • Current approach that in principle seeks to retain employment sites but recognises that individual site, viability and environmental circumstances need to be taken fully into account, together with an assessment of community benefits that may flow from redevelopment for other uses, is considered to be reasonable. It should not be necessary to apply more detailed tests. <p>Option B:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear viability evidence should be required before change of use is permitted. • Also should consider including these sites under the community assets register. • The Local Plan should resist the loss of employment land universally, unless it is proven to be unsuitable through the new tests. • Support this proposal as current test can be easily worked around by applicants. • Support from 12 Parish Councils <p>OBJECTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recommend that the Local Plan is explicit that previously developed land will be looked upon favourably. • It holds up businesses from making the necessary moves to enable them survive or even to grow. It is inconceivable that councils who do not have business expertise are creating problems for businesses that they are supposed to be helping. • The Council should accept the possibility that existing or proposed land may not come forward or be viable for economic development. A more complex, costly and time consuming test will only deliver further delays and probably no difference to the result. • The continued restriction of employment sites to B1/B2/B8 uses provides insufficient flexibility to enable vacant and underused sites to be re-used for other employment generating uses.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Maintain a policy which protects employment land in villages, and extend to include sites on the edges of villages. Include additional details to make the marketing element of the tests more robust.</p> <p>Evidence highlights the importance of maintaining employment land to the sustainability of villages. There are important employment sites on the edges of villages where the loss would have similar negative impacts to sites inside a village framework.</p>

	<p>The policy should therefore be widened to encompass areas outside frameworks on the edges of villages.</p> <p>However, the NPPF states that 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. The policy must find the balance between establishing tests that enable economic uses to be maintained where possible, and not creating additional hurdles and costs which have the same result at the end. A suitable compromise is to make the marketing element of the policy more robust, but not add additional tests which could require vacant employment sites to remain empty in the longer term despite there being no interest in the site.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/14: Loss of Employment Land to Non-Employment Uses
Policy E/14: Loss of Employment Land to Non Employment Uses (and paragraphs 8.54 and 8.55)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 7 Support: 1 Object: 6</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully supportive in restricting development employment sites. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourn Parish Council – Support the policy, but it should include formal consultation with Parish Councils. 12 months marketing is not enough. It must be shown that a very robust marketing strategy has been implemented to retain land for employment. It should be VERY difficult to get employment land approved for housing. Policy is unduly restrictive. Does not deal with derelict sites. Need to take account of viability. If not viable for employment marketing not required. Negative presumption within Policy against alternative uses, at odds with NPPF which states Planning Policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is little prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Policy ET6, which would be replaced by Policy E/14 does not require valuation to be agreed with Council before marketing properties stated in 8.55. Instead Council has ability to seek independent advice when it considers a property has been

	<p>inappropriately valued. Insufficient evidence to justify proposed change in approach. May add delay, cost and place additional burden on developer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If one of criteria a, b, or c has been met it should not be necessary to meet point 2 - should be deleted.
Assessment	<p>Maintaining the supply of employment land is important to the sustainability of villages. The policy aims to support the retention of village employment whilst avoiding long term protection that would be inconsistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Paragraph 2 of the policy seeks to identify whether any element of employment could be achieved on a redeveloped site. It is a reasonable requirement where scarce village employment uses are being lost.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.55 seeks for the marketing terms to be agreed, to ensure a fair marketing exercise is carried out. By agreeing terms upfront it will help the applicant avoid the risk of the Council considering a site has not been marketed fairly at the end of the period.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/15: Established Employment Areas

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 66	Established Employment Areas in the Countryside
Key evidence	Employment Land Review Update 2012
Existing policies	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 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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</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"> Eternit UK site between Meldreth and Whaddon; Barrington Cement Works (area of existing and former buildings)
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>A policy identifying and supporting development in established areas in the countryside would enable the reuse and development of existing sites, therefore positive impacts on achievement of economic objectives, and also making best use of land.</p> <p>Cumulative impact of additional development on a site or district wide, would need to be considered, and the impacts of development on objectives such as landscape and townscape, are again addressed by other options. A negative impact has been identified against sustainable travel objective, due to the rural location of a number of sites. As they are all existing sites, the impact has not been classified as significant, but it would depend on the scale of development permitted. Other options regarding planning for sustainable travel would also be a consideration when considering proposals. Adding additional sites would have similar impacts.</p>
Representations Received	<p>A. Support: 21 Object: 3 Comment: 8 Bi. Support: 6 Object: 6 Comment: 2 Bii. Support: 9 Object: 4 Comment: 3</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Should development within established employment areas in the countryside be allowed? SUPPORT:</p>

- Utilise existing asset base, support viability of sites and enable redevelopment.
- Support from 8 Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council.

OBJECTIONS:

- No need for a policy.
- Whaddon Parish Council – this should not be allowed.

COMMENTS:

- Should be amended to allow the expansion of existing business parks where it would have no impact on the surrounding area.
- Area of Granta Park should be expanded to reflect existing development on the park.

i. Eternit UK site

SUPPORT:

- Support from 2 Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council

OBJECTIONS:

- Too many heavy lorries coming through Whaddon, and increase traffic on already busy A1198;
- Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council – object unless heavy goods vehicles are prohibited from using Chestnut Lane to access the site, or highway improvements are carried out including provision of a footway between A1198 and the wireless station site.
- Whaddon Parish Council - The local infrastructure does not support the increased traffic this would cause.
- Haslingfield Parish Council – Poor infrastructure and significant environmental impact.
- CPRE – site not in a sustainable location.

ii. Barrington Cement Works

SUPPORT:

- Barrington itself has a mixture of enterprises, the cement works should mimic this
- Any development for employment on this site must be carefully planned so that traffic in villages is minimised or indeed reduced.
- Employment opportunities in this area are limited. Using the land for infill would not create long-term jobs.
- Support from 4 Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whaddon Parish Council – local infrastructure would not support increase in traffic. • Haslingfield Parish council – Poor infrastructure and significant environmental impact. • CPRE – site not in a sustainable location. • CEMEX - There is no permanent employment on-site and it is incorrect to describe it as being of "significant existing employment development". Considers the site is suitable for residential-led development, including other uses.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include policy in Local Plan, with the addition of the Eternit site, but not the Barrington Cement Works.</p> <p>The Established Employment Areas policy identifies major employment areas, and supports their continued use and adaptation. The 'Established Employment Areas in The Countryside' designation is not intended to allocate additional land for employment development, or to allow sites to expand into the countryside unchecked. They have been drawn around previously developed major employment sites, or land that has been committed for development i.e. land with planning permission.</p> <p>The Eternit site is similar to a number of other sites already included in the policy. Primary concerns regarding the Eternit site relate to traffic. However these concerns can be addressed by other policy requirements in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Barrington Cement Works, received support for maintaining employment opportunities, including from four Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council. Concern regarding unsustainable location for development, and concern from Whaddon Parish Council regarding traffic. CEMEX state that there is no permanent employment on-site and it is incorrect to describe it as being of "significant existing employment development". They consider that the site is suitable for residential-led development, including other uses.</p> <p>The works were associated with the quarry, which is no longer in significant production. The works closed four years ago, with subsequent demolition being undertaken on the plant. It does not compare with the other areas, which are in active use. Its status and as an established employment site is therefore questionable.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy E/15: Established Employment Areas</p>

Policy E/15: Established Employment Areas (and paragraphs 8.56 to 8.58)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 5 Support: 2 Object: 3
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Granta Park/TWI and the Wellcome Trust support the policy and the amended boundaries shown on the policies map. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Babraham Bioscience Technologies - Babraham Research Campus should be removed from the Green Belt to deliver new specialist research and development floorspace. • Richard Arbon - Syngenta Site Whittlesord should be removed from the green belt and identified as an established employment area. Site should not be lost to employment as other village sites have. • John Shepperson - Buckingham Business Park Swavesey should be expanded to the east. SCDC assessment identified no significant constraints. Need for employment land. Most sites near to Cambridge serve only high tech.
Assessment	<p>The policy does not identify sites in the Green Belt, as these are covered by other policies regarding appropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Separate representations have been made seeking changes to the Green Belt. In both cases the Green Belt boundary is considered sound.</p> <p>The Established Employment Areas policy identifies major employment areas, and supports their continued use and adaptation. The 'Established Employment Areas in The Countryside' designation is not intended to allocate additional land for employment development, or to allow sites to expand into the countryside unchecked. They have been drawn around previously developed major employment sites, or land that has been committed for development i.e. land with planning permission.</p> <p>Proposals for additional development at Babraham Research Campus were not made at previous stages of the plan making process. Given the general land supply situation there is not a compelling case for amending the Green Belt. Proposals can be considered through the planning application process as to whether site specific issues warrant exceptional circumstances within the</p>

	<p>Green Belt.</p> <p>Expansion at Buckingham was considered and rejected through the issues and options stage. Around a third of the existing Buckingham site remains undeveloped. Additional employment land allocation is not needed to make the plan sound.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Established Employment Areas in the Countryside – Boundary of Granta Park

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy E/15: Established Employment Areas

<p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2) Issue 3</p> <p>(also addressed by Issues and Options 2012 Issue 66)</p>	<p>Established Employment Areas in the Countryside – Boundary of Granta Park</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	<p>Employment Land Review Update 2012</p>
<p>Existing policies</p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD: ET/3 Development in Established Employment Areas in the Countryside</p>
<p>Analysis</p>	<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 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>A representation was made to the Council's 2012 Issues and Options consultation which indicated that the boundary of the Granta Park site at Great Abington does not reflect the established area, particularly phase 2 of the development which now has planning permission. It is proposed that the area consistent with the permission is included in the policy area.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the</p>

	area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 3: Do you support or object to the revised boundary to the Granta Park Established Employment Area boundary, and why?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	anges have been sought to the boundary of the Granta Park Great Abington site in particular to reflect phase 2 of the development which now has planning permission. An option is included in the consultation to reflect this change in circumstances. This has been assessed against the principles of the policy, and does not change to sustainability appraisal outcomes. A further comment proposed an additional area south of Pampisford Road be included, for secondary development or landscaping. However, given the underdeveloped nature of the land, and the separation from the employment site, it is not recommended for inclusion.
Representations Received	Support: 6 Object: 3 Comment: 1
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical update to the established employment area boundary to reflect the current built form and extant planning consents that existing on the site. • Development should be contingent on improved public transport and cycleway provision. • BioMed Realty – Support, but should include extra area on southern boundary. • Little Abington Parish Council - supports this proposal if it reflects planning proposals that have already been formally agreed. <p>OBJECT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellcome Trust - has outline planning permission for the final Phase 3 of the extension to the Genome Campus known as 'South Field'. Southern boundary of the Established Employment Area in the Countryside designation for the Genome Campus be amended • Site has never built a cycle route to Cambridge; • Natural England – Development of significant area of agricultural land; <p>COMMENT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage - Abington Hall is a Grade II* listed building and English Heritage is concerned that its setting must be adequately protected. There may be some scope for expansion of the employment land to the south of the hall but this will need careful masterplanning to ensure that the setting of the hall is not further eroded.

<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>In order to reflect planned development at Granta Park phase 2, amend the boundary on the eastern side of the site.</p> <p>A representation proposed a small additional area to the south of the site in the ownership of the park owners, however this is separated from the site by Pampisford Road, and is not considered to form part of the established employment area.</p> <p>In addition, the area around the south field of Genome Campus should also be amended to reflect planning permissions granted, in particular the outline permission granted in 2010.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy E/15: Established Employment Areas</p>

Policy E/16: Expansion of Existing Businesses in the Countryside

Issues and Options 2012 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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 69: What approach should be taken to extension of existing businesses in the countryside?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. continue to apply a generally restrictive approach, where proposals would have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances; or 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.
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>A key difference of not including a policy to support extensions (option i) is a potentially negative effect on the growth of existing businesses, which could harm achievement of economic objectives. The scale of that impact is unclear, but there are a significant number of businesses located in the countryside.</p>

	<p>If a policy supporting the extension of existing businesses is included (option ii), there are potential site by site impacts on biodiversity and landscape and townscape, and historic environment objectives. Appropriate criteria would need to be included in the policy or the wider plan to ensure these objectives are not compromised. There are potential negative impacts on achievement of sustainable transport objectives as more flexible option could create jobs in areas with limited alternatives to the car. It will be important that scale of impacts are considered if the option is selected.</p> <p>If option ii is taken forward and a policy is developed, it will be important to refer to other objectives, or to issues addressed elsewhere, in particular, landscape, biodiversity and transport.</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>i: Support: 15 Object: 1 Comment: 1 ii: Support: 28 Object: 3 Comment: 1</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>Option i:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambs is overdeveloped and new development, whether business or housing, should be discouraged. • Isolated development in the countryside is highly undesirable • We currently have too many vacant premises which businesses are not renting. This needs careful thought and investigation into why businesses are not using a rural site. • Support from 4 Parish Councils <p>Option ii:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such an approach needs careful consideration. Given the existing restrictions on development in South Cambs, a business case does have to be made. • This is in line with policies in the NPPF which urge LPA policies to be flexible to meet changing needs of local businesses. • Permit some growth as long as the scale and character are consistent with the local conditions and wishes of the community. • An overly restrictive approach to existing businesses in the countryside discourages investment and growth. • A flexible approach to the provision of employment provision in and adjoining villages should be taken to enable the relevant circumstances pertaining at the time of any application to be taken into consideration. • But there needs to be some kind of provision which would oblige businesses to stay put for a number of years. That would guard against firms extending and then making windfall

	<p>profits by selling up and moving on shortly thereafter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from 14 Parish Councils <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not clear what is 'appropriate' in this context. The council should continue to support expansion only in exceptional cases. • This option provides too much opportunity for those with financial incentives to exercise biased judgements on what is appropriate, and hence destroy valuable greenfield land.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy which supports expansion of existing firms, where schemes are of an appropriate scale, do not have an adverse impact in terms of character and amenity, and can be justified through submission of a business case (subject to the requirements of Green Belt policy).</p> <p>Whilst there was some support for maintaining a restrictive approach to development in the countryside, the majority of representations support a more flexible approach to support the needs of businesses. The NPPF requires plans to 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. The Local Plan needs to provide a context for considering proposals, including criteria to ensure they are appropriate for the location.</p> <p>Criteria included in the policy seek to ensure that the policy is supporting growth of existing firms, rather than speculative development in the countryside.</p> <p>The restriction to only applying policy to Previously Developed Land is rejected because it would not deliver the flexibility needed to support the rural economy.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/16: Expansion of Existing Businesses in the Countryside
Policy E/16: Expansion of Existing Businesses in the Countryside (and paragraphs 8.59 to 8.60)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 4</p> <p>Support: 2</p> <p>Object: 2</p>

<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers appropriate encouragement for the sustainable growth of existing businesses in rural areas. • Support for paragraph 8.60 in clarifying the scale of growth must be sustainable. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council – Weakens existing policy, the original period of operation of 5 years in the LDF has been reduced to just 2 years, and the restrictions on the scale of development have been removed. Fails to provide for a formal consultation process with Parish Councils.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>The policy needs to ensure firms are established, but not be overly restrictive. It is considered that a two year establishment period offers this balance better than a five year period. Criteria have been included in order that scale of development can be controlled to be appropriate to the location.</p> <p>Parish Councils will already be consulted through the planning application process.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Policy E/17: Conversion or Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 70	Conversion or Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: <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</p>

	addressed.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 70:</p> <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>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Allowing conversion or replacement of rural buildings (option A) has a positive impact on the land objective, by reusing existing land and buildings. There is potential support for heritage objectives if employment uses support retention of historic or character buildings. There is also positive impact on employment objectives, although impacts likely to be minor due to scale of the resource available, as many buildings have already been converted. However there could be a negative impact on sustainable transport objectives, as some buildings may be located in isolated areas. It will be important that any policy requires consideration of the scale of the transport impact (although this is addressed by other options). Equally there are potential site specific impacts on landscape and townscape, biodiversity and other objectives, addressed by other options.</p> <p>Benefits of employment rather than residential relate to transport, as employment may generate less trips, although this depends on the scale of and nature of individual proposals. They also mean buildings are used to continue to support the rural economy.</p> <p>Option B regarding extensions could help make buildings work better, whilst the option also refers to appropriate safeguards to protect rural character.</p>

Representations Received	A: Support: 31 Object: 3 Comment: 4 B: Support: 24 Object: 0 Comment: 1
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Option A:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general the use of agricultural buildings for small businesses seems to work. • Proposals should be considered on their merits. Traffic generation should only be one factor to be taken into account. • Plan should be supportive in all cases save extreme problems with traffic generation. • Support from 17 Parish Councils. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fen Ditton Parish Council - Housing should be a priority. • Where development is proposed in rural areas, permission should not be refused on the basis that the proposal does not promote sustainable forms of transport and reduction of car use. • This should not be prioritised. Each case should be considered on its merits. There are too many cases of very inappropriate re-use of farm buildings for activities related to employment. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has led to an oversupply of employment spaces in unsuitable or unattractive locations for businesses. There should now be a flexible approach that seeks to make provision as needed, for the use for either residential or employment, to be determined in consultation with the appropriate parish council. <p>Option B:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not have to enhance the design. Design requirements should not be imposed to restrict rural employment where statutory heritage or landscape designations are not affected, in line with NPPF; • Local Plan should ensure that the size and design of any conversion is appropriate and in keeping with the overall character of the village, that appropriate transport opportunities exist and that traffic generation as a consequence of the development has no detrimental effect on the existing village community; • Continue the restrictive approach for green belt villages and perhaps more flexibility elsewhere. • Support from 12 Parish Councils

<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include a policy in the Local Plan which continues to support the reuse of rural buildings for economic purposes. Amend policy to be supportive of extension where it would enhance the design and not be out of scale and character with the location.</p> <p>The NPPF requires a positive approach to 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.</p> <p>There is general support for a change for greater flexibility regarding extensions to converted buildings, but this should be where design is enhanced.</p> <p>In response to objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not unreasonable to require such extensions to enhance the design of converted buildings, as achieving good design is a central element of the NPPF, and many rural buildings will be visually prominent. • The NPPF establishes that 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. This is addressed in the draft policy.
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy E/17: Conversion or Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment</p>
<p>Policy E/17: Conversion or Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment (and paragraph 8.61)</p>	
<p>Proposed Submission Representations Received</p>	<p>Total: 2 Support: 0 Object: 2</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally support this policy, but consider that it should provide greater flexibility by allowing for the development of live / work units. • As the policy relates to the re-use of existing buildings without material changes, the form, bulk and general design will not be altered. Furthermore the building will remain in its existing context and surroundings. Therefore, what is the intention and meaning of paragraph c?
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>Following consideration through the Issues and Options process, the Local Plan retains an employment first preference as in the current LDF. Policy H/16 supports residential development if</p>

	<p>employment uses are not possible.</p> <p>The intention of part c is to ensure that existing buildings are suitable for conversion, in terms of their form, bulk and general design. It has been included in previous South Cambridgeshire Development Plans, and remains a sound element of the policy.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Policy E/18: Farm Diversification

Issues and Options 2012 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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p>

	Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Question 71: Do you agree that the Local Plan should continue to support farm diversification?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Potential to support reuse of existing buildings, making good use of existing farm resources, by supporting working farms. Positive support for economic objectives, by supporting the viability of working farms. Potential negative impact on sustainable transport, policies will need to ensure proposals are an appropriate scale for their location.
Representations Received	Support: 33 Object: 0 Comment: 3
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should continue to support farm diversification to assist the viability of agricultural businesses. • There should be provision in the Plan for farm diversification especially through renewable energy technologies. • Support appropriate farm diversification providing the diverse additions have some synergy with farming. • Diversification takes many forms and should allow for the re-use of existing buildings, the establishment of new uses and the building of new floor space where that floor space is needed to enable a scheme to work functionally and financially. • Such diversification needs to be carefully monitored as it could turn out to be a Trojan Horse for relatively large retail establishments • Support from 17 Parish Councils <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the prescriptive reference to 'working farm' as we believe there are many types of rural enterprises that fall within different categories that operate within the same challenging environment and pressures. We therefore believe this reference should be widened to the more suitable term 'rural enterprises'. • Depends entirely on the location of the site and the type of diversification
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy in the local plan supporting farm diversification.</p> <p>Agriculture is an important sector in South Cambridgeshire, and diversification can help to support working farms. There are sufficient controls, including through other policies, to ensure a scheme is appropriate to the location.</p>

	The NPPF now refers to 'agricultural and other land-based rural businesses' as opposed to farm diversification, and this term has been utilised in the policy.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/18: Farm Diversification
Policy E/18: Farm Diversification (and paragraphs 8.62 and 8.63)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 0 Object: 8
Main Issues	Object <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A cohesive bridleway network opens up opportunities for farm diversification into horse-related business (bed and breakfast, holidays etc). Should add reference to horse riding. • Dernford Farm Great Shelford / Sawston – allocate as leisure / tourism facility utilising former mineral workings.
Assessment	The Dernford farm site was not submitted through the issues and options consultation process. Dernford Farm is located within the Green Belt. There is not sufficient justification to allocate land for development for a major tourism facility, and the plan remains sound.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/19: Tourist Facilities and Visitor Attractions

<p>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 74</p>	<p>Tourist facilities and visitor attractions</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	
<p>Existing policies</p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD: ET/10 Tourist Facilities and Visitor Accommodation</p>
<p>Analysis</p>	<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: 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 appropriate transport accessibility, including by sustainable modes.</p>

<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 74: A: Should the Local Plan contain a policy supporting the development of appropriate tourist facilities and visitor attractions? B: Could these be located in the countryside?</p>
<p>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</p>	<p>The Scoping Report identified the important role of tourism in the South Cambridgeshire economy. Supporting development of attractions would therefore support the economic objectives. Similar to a number of options relating to development in the countryside, the option supporting development in the countryside could impact on sustainable transport objectives as it could increase journeys of visitors by car. Impact would depend on the scale of the development and the location. The Issues and Options Report makes specific reference to proposals not detrimentally impact on landscape, and that they must be in scale with the location.</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>A: Support: 27 Object: 4 Comment: 4 B: Support: 14 Object: 3 Comment: 6</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>Option A:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor attractions can be of benefit to the local community both as visitors and employees. • Only if they exploit an existing attraction. • IWM Duxford and National Trust support the development of

	<p>tourist facilities and visitor attractions in the countryside.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from 11 Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no need for a local Plan generic solution • Should not support further influx of tourists into this area <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism takes many forms and should allow for the reuse of existing buildings, the establishment of new uses and the building of new floor space where that floor space is needed to enable a scheme to work functionally and financially. • Should recognise the importance of the natural environment and landscape setting in attracting and enhancing the experience of visitors and tourists to the district. <p>Option B:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in the Cambridge Green Belt, elsewhere possibly, but the scope is limited. • Provision of transport accessibility and sustainable transport modes would need to be part of a joined up strategy. • For instance for Parks and wildlife areas such as RSPB Reserves. • Support from 8 Parish Councils <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conversion of existing buildings should be subject to expansion constraints of any other business. • No need for a Local Plan generic solution. Consider on a case by case basis with a full public planning process. • Objection from 2 Parish Councils <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to be in keeping with their settings. • A commercial viability test may need to be required.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include a policy in the Local plan which supports development of tourist facilities utilising and enhancing the areas existing tourism assets.</p> <p>The importance of tourism was recognised in representations, but also concern that development should be of a sustainable scale, and not cause harm to the landscape and the assets of the district. The policy aims to achieve an appropriate balance.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy E/19: Tourist Facilities and Visitor Attraction</p>

Policy E/19: Tourist Facilities and Visitor Attractions (and paragraphs 8.64 and 8.65)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 12 Support: 0 Object: 12
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage - Part c of the policy is phrased so as to allow some degree of adverse impact to local character. We would prefer a more positive wording, and one that allowed for enhancement. • National Trust - It is unclear what "in scale with its location" means for an existing large scale tourism attraction. The second part of the sentence appears to be duplicated in part e. of the policy. • National Trust – Concern with last sentence of paragraph 8.65. The scale of growth proposed in the SC and CC Local Plans will mean that existing tourism sites are put under increasing pressure to expand. If limitations are to be placed on existing sites but no further sites are to be encouraged then how will the Council plan pro-actively to provide tourism-based leisure to meet the demands of a growing population? • IWM Duxford seek amendment to part c to include no significant adverse impact on operation and function of the area. • Add horse riding to point e - "walking, cycling, horse riding and public transport". • Object to policy item f on the basis that sustainable site management of green spaces requires on-site accommodation to make them more viable and sustainable, especially in urban fringe and rural areas.
Assessment	<p>The policy aims to support a sustainable scale of development, which supports the continued success of the district's attractions.</p> <p>Part c aims to ensure proposals are in scale with their location. A minor amendment is proposed to clarify that this will depend on the nature of the facility being supported. The traffic issue is addressed by paragraph e, so does not need to be repeated in c.</p> <p>It is also agreed that the policy could support opportunities for horse-riding.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend Policy E/19 part d to read: 'The scheme is in scale with its location, <u>and the nature of the facility it supports</u> particularly in relation to the amount and nature of traffic</p>

	<p>generated;</p> <p>Amend Policy E/19 part e to read: The proposal maximises sustainable travel opportunities, including walking, cycling, <u>horse-riding</u> and public transport. Proposals which would have a significant adverse impact in terms of the amount or nature of traffic generated will be refused'</p>
--	---

Policy E/20: Tourist Accommodation

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 74	Tourist facilities and visitor attractions
Key evidence	
Existing policies	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 appropriate</p>

	transport accessibility, including by sustainable modes.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
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>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>The Scoping Report identified the important role of tourism in the South Cambridgeshire economy. Supporting development of attractions would therefore support the economic objectives. Similar to a number of options relating to development in the countryside, the option supporting development in the countryside could impact on sustainable transport objectives as it could increase journeys of visitors by car. Impact would depend on the scale of the development and the location. The Issues and Options Report makes specific reference to proposals not detrimentally impact on landscape, and that they must be in scale with the location.</p>
Representations Received	<p>A: Support: 27 Object: 4 Comment: 4</p> <p>B: Support: 14 Object: 3 Comment: 6</p>

<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>Option A:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor attractions can be of benefit to the local community both as visitors and employees. • Only if they exploit an existing attraction. • IWM Duxford and National Trust support the development of tourist facilities and visitor attractions in the countryside. • Support from 11 Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no need for a local Plan generic solution • Should not support further influx of tourists into this area <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism takes many forms and should allow for the reuse of existing buildings, the establishment of new uses and the building of new floor space where that floor space is needed to enable a scheme to work functionally and financially. • Should recognise the importance of the natural environment and landscape setting in attracting and enhancing the experience of visitors and tourists to the district. <p>Option B:</p> <p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in the Cambridge Green Belt, elsewhere possibly, but the scope is limited. • Provision of transport accessibility and sustainable transport modes would need to be part of a joined up strategy. • For instance for Parks and wildlife areas such as RSPB Reserves. • Support from 8 Parish Councils <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conversion of existing buildings should be subject to expansion constraints of any other business. • No need for a Local Plan generic solution. Consider on a case by case basis with a full public planning process. • Objection from 2 Parish Councils <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to be in keeping with their settings. • A commercial viability test may need to be required.
---	--

Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy in the Local plan which supports development of tourist facilities utilising and enhancing the areas existing tourism assets.</p> <p>The importance of tourism was recognised in representations, but also concern that development should be of a sustainable scale, and not cause harm to the landscape and the assets of the district. The policy aims to achieve an appropriate balance.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/19: Tourist Facilities and Visitor Attraction
Policy E/20: Tourist Accommodation (and paragraph 8.66)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 9</p> <p>Support: 2</p> <p>Object: 7</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the development of tourist facilities/accommodation in the countryside. • This policy could help struggling or closed public houses to become re-vitalised by the addition of sensitively developed accommodation. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add reference to horse riding.
Assessment	The policy appropriately addresses tourist accommodation, and does not need specific reference to horse riding. Any stabling proposals could be considered on their merits.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/21: Retail Hierarchy

Issues and Options 2012 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 Village Classification Report 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;

	<p>b. Rural Centres village centres; c. Other villages</p> <p>The proposed hierarchy reflects the nature of settlements in the district.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</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>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Delivering a hierarchy of centres supports sustainable travel objectives, by ensuring large scale facilities are delivered in appropriately accessible locations where alternatives to the car are available.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i. Support: 25 Object: 2 Comment: 2 ii Support: 1 Object: 2 Comment: 2</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hierarchy correct - development within any one should be appropriate for the situation. • Need to maintain town/village high streets as shopping centres, rather than out of town supermarkets • Support from 12 Parish Councils

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council - Cambourne should be identified as a town centre. • Cambridge City Council - If major developments come forward, adequate shops and facilities must exist to serve the population's day-to-day needs, without the need to travel. Retail diversity and distinctiveness, with a mix of retail units and scope for independent trading is also important. The City Council suggests that South Cambridgeshire District Council considers Option 136 of the Cambridge's Issues and Options Report as an approach. • Existing supermarket provision within the south of the District is currently limited. As a Rural Centre, Sawston is the most appropriate location to meet such requirements sustainably, reducing travel in the south of the District. • The Council's retail evidence base should be updated to ensure the Plan is based on a robust, up-to-date evidence base.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Carry forward hierarchy into the new Local Plan. Note: If new settlements allocated in the plan, they would need to be added at appropriate levels to the hierarchy.</p> <p>There was general support for maintaining the retail hierarchy. Cambridge City Council considers Cambourne should be identified as a town rather than Rural Centre. Cambourne is comparable to other Rural Centres in scale, as opposed to nearby market towns or the eventual scale of Northstowe. The retail offering is focusing on serving the village, and a rural hinterland. Cambourne is not a sustainable location for retail facilities that attract significant numbers of trips, and does not merit a higher position in the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Retail Needs Assessment indicates a low level of need from convenience shopping apart from meeting needs generated by growth sites.</p> <p>The needs of any major new sites will need to be considered and appropriate provision made. This is addressed in the promoting successful communities chapter.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy E/21: Retail Hierarchy</p>
<p>Policy E/21: Retail Hierarchy (and paragraphs 8.67 to 8.70)</p>	
<p>Proposed Submission Representations</p>	<p>Total: 4 Support: 2 Object: 2</p>

Received	
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Towns and town centres first is consistent with national policies including the NPPF. • New retail development should remain to be encouraged within the Rural Centres, in order that services and facilities can continue to support additional growth in these areas at a proportionate level. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council / Caldecote Parish Council - Item a, should read 'town centres' and not list names as in the other Retail Hierarchy categories. This allows other settlement centres or settlements to be upgraded as they develop and grow.
Assessment	The role of settlements should be established in the Local Plan. If the role of a settlement changes this could be addressed through a Local Plan review. Cambourne is correctly identified as a Rural Centre.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/22: Applications for New Retail Development

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 76	Assessing the Impact of Retail Development
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: 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 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.</p>

	This could mean additional information required from applicants, but it would enable greater consideration of cumulative impact.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 76: What should be the floorspace threshold above which retail impact assessments are required?</p> <p>i. 2500m² - large superstore ii. 500m² - village scale supermarket iii. 250m² - typical village shop</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Ensuring the impact of significant retail development on viability and viability of existing centres is appropriately considered has positive benefits for the access to services and facilities objective, and creation places which work well by ensuring facilities an appropriate scale for their location. All three options are aiming to address this, but their effectiveness would vary. The default threshold (option i) may be too high to achieve the established goals in the South Cambridgeshire context, and could even have a negative impact by not requiring the impact of large stores to be appropriately assessed. The lowest threshold (option iii) would provide the greatest certainty, but could also create additional cost for relatively small proposals.
Representations Received	<p>i: Support: 1 Object: 1 Comment: 0 ii: Support:10 Object: 0 Comment: 1 iii: Support: 20 Object: 0 Comment: 0</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT FOR OPTION i:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence to justify a lower threshold and demonstrate that this would be 'proportionate' as required by the NPPF. Should use net sales floorspace in determining appropriate retail thresholds within any future policy since it is only the

	<p>sales floorspace that generates the impact.</p> <p>SUPPORT FOR OPTION ii:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small, village scale supermarkets can often improve the viability of village centres by increasing footfall. Large retail outlets selling a wide range of goods are more likely to stifle competition. • A threshold below 500 sq metres would put an unacceptable load on the planning staff with probably marginal value. • suggest for larger villages above 3,000 population • Support from 6 Parish Councils <p>SUPPORT FOR OPTION iii:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger stores definitely need to be controlled. • Would allow consideration to be given to the impact of out-of-centre convenience stores on small local and village centres. • The assessment does not preclude having a new store - so give most a proper assessment and avoid problems. • for smaller villages below 3,000 population • Support from 10 Parish Councils <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council - sensible that the floorspace threshold above which retail impact assessments would be required is lower than the NPPF level of 2,500 square metres given the rural nature of the district. Different threshold may be needed for larger development e.g. Northstowe.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include a threshold for retail impact assessments of 500m2 in the village centres of Rural Centres, and 250m2 elsewhere.</p> <p>There was significant support for having a lower threshold than the default set by the NPPF of 2,500m2. An impact assessment does not preclude development; it ensures any significant impacts are identified. Policies elsewhere support the development of village shops, and retail that reflects the nature and scale of the settlement. Typical village stores are around 250m2 (Co-op Cottenham, Gamlingay), whilst larger village supermarkets (Tesco Express Histon / Great Shelford, Co-op Fulbourn) are around 500m2. In village centres of rural centres, the larger scale supermarkets of up to 500m2 would be appropriate, but it would be appropriate to test the impact of larger stores. Outside these areas and in smaller villages, a lower threshold of 250m2 would be appropriate, as a larger store could impact on the viability of village centres. The impact of these thresholds can be monitored, and reviewed in the future if necessary.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy E/22: Applications for New Retail Development</p>

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 78	Village Shops and Related Local Services
Key evidence	Cambridge Sub-Regional Retail Study 2008
Existing policies	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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	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?

Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Enabling development of appropriately scaled village shops would support a range of objectives particularly access to services and facilities. It would also support the redressing inequalities objectives by supporting development of services in rural areas.
Representations Received	Support: 69 Object: 2 Comment: 5
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To assist regeneration of village high streets, support service provision for those less able to travel or who are reliant on public transport; Village shop forms a community hub. • Need to consider traffic impact. • It should be expected that any new developments should be able to link into the existing retail core with good pedestrian connections • The Plan should look to encourage the entrepreneurship of the members of the community wherever possible through flexibility and indeed presumptions in favour of such activities. • Support from 23 Parish Councils <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any policy needs to consider not just the scale and function of the village but the wider rural catchment that it serves having regard to retail hierarchy. The scale of development within Rural Centres for instance should reflect the fact that such villages serve a wider rural catchment than just the villages themselves.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy supporting the development of village shops and services of an appropriate size related to the scale and function of the village.</p> <p>The policy supports village shops and services of an appropriate size to the scale and function of the village. This is important to help support accessibility of services, and maintain the sustainability of villages.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised in representations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Retail Hierarchy policy acknowledges that Rural Centres serve a local catchment. • Reference to enhancing existing village centres has been included in the supporting text.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/22: Applications for New Retail Development

Policy E/22: Applications for New Retail Development (and paragraphs 8.71 to 8.74)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 7 Support: 2 Object: 5
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council – Support retail impact assessment thresholds. • Fulbourn Parish Council - Protects the intrinsic character of the village and surrounding countryside. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local thresholds will be difficult to implement. There are no defined village centre boundaries and in their absence a single local threshold should be adopted which requires all retail schemes over 250 square metres gross within the Rural Centres to be supported by a retail impact assessment. • Approach to local thresholds for impact assessment is not proportionate and places an unnecessary burden on an applicant, contrary to the provisions of the NPPF in paragraph 21. The suggested threshold set out in the NPPF requiring a retail impact assessment for stores outside a centre is 2,500sqm. • Council's Retail Study contains flaws and underestimates retail need. It ignores overtrading. It is out of date.
Assessment	<p>With regard to the retail impact threshold, the Council considered a range of options before determining a reasonable threshold for the district. A slightly higher threshold for Rural Centres recognises that they are typically home to slightly larger stores. Due to the difficulties identifying village centres, a more qualitative approach was selected, which can be applied on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Additional retail need would be associated with the needs of major development, and would be addressed through policies in the chapter on Promoting Successful Communities.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Meeting Retail Needs in North West Cambridge

No policy included in Proposed Submission Local Plan

Issues and Options 2012 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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</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?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	There is an identified need for improved provision of convenience shopping in North West Cambridge which this option should address. By enabling people to access food shopping locally it will contribute to sustainable transport objectives. Delivering appropriately scaled stores will also contribute to creating good spaces that work well.

Representations Received	Support: 7 Object: 4 Comment:4
Key Issues from Representations	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has been looked at hard for a long time so it is time it entered Policy. • Support from 2 Parish Councils <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern fringe of Cambridge already has 2 large superstores (Bar Hill and Milton) and that there would not be a need for a further 2 medium sized stores. • Further consideration should be given to local shopping provision, particularly south of the district (Sawston). Council's evidence base should be updated. • Objection from 2 Parish Councils • Cambridge City Council - Need for new retail must be considered where new development is proposed. Cambridge Sub-Region Retail Study 2008 covers the period to 2021. The new Plan will cover the period to 2031. Many of the assumptions made in this study may be out of date. (Note: CCC have also proposed to carry forward the North West Cambridge Retail policy)
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Do not include a policy on north west Cambridge in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The retail referred to in the informal policy has now largely gained planning permission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orchard Park (August 2012) • North West Cambridge University Site (August 2012) • NIAB 1 (Cambridge City have resolved to grant Planning permission subject to s106) <p>It is no longer necessary to include a policy in the Local Plan.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	No policy

Policy E/23: Retailing in the Countryside

Issues and Options 2012 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>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.

	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 79: Do you think that retail development in the countryside should be restricted?</p> <p>i. As described.</p> <p>ii. To include additional facilities.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>e option proposes to restrict retail development in the countryside, with the aim of supporting vitality of existing centres, but giving flexibility to support rural businesses. It would contribute positively to the sustainable transport objective by restricting development in less accessible locations.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i. Support: 31 Object: 3 Comment: 2</p> <p>ii. Support: 3 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Option i:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions have to be made to see if the proposal is sustainable. • To help maintain the financial viability of shops in the villages and to reduce car journeys, and avoid urbanisation of the countryside • Strongly support this, but "convenience goods ancillary to other uses" sounds open to abuse. • Support from 15 Parish Councils • Proposed policy is too prescriptive. Flexibility is required. <p>Option ii:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If existing retail development is already in existence, support should be given to allow them to expand if not detrimental to facilities in surrounding villages, in accordance with the NPPF which is seeking to boost rural economy. Existing retail facilities need to be able to grow, especially if it is creating new job opportunities.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy in the new Local Plan restricting retail development in the countryside.</p> <p>Sporadic development of retail in the countryside could support unsustainable patterns of development, and undermine village and town centres. However, there are some retail uses that need a countryside location and can support the rural economy. The current policy strikes the right balance. It would not be appropriate for a policy to support the general growth of retail in the countryside which did not need a countryside location.</p>

Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy E/23: Retailing in the Countryside
Policy E/23: Retailing in the Countryside (and paragraph 8.75)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 0 Object: 8
Main Issues	Object <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overly restrictive in respect of existing retail uses. Does not support uses unsuited to a town centre location, and development of existing rural retail businesses. Add reference to horse riding.
Assessment	It would not be appropriate for a policy to support the general growth of retail in the countryside which did not need a countryside location.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change