

## Chapter 9: Promoting Successful Communities

Key facts and paragraphs 9.1 – 9.3	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 2 Object: 2
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Inter-Church Contact Group</b> – insufficient weight given to community infrastructure needed to support development. Much space given to transport infrastructure whilst few references to cultural and community infrastructure. Experience of new developments (Cambourne and Orchard Park) show existing or new churches play vital role in supporting emerging communities – undervalued role.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for New Communities and Health &amp; Housing highlights importance of green space to supporting mental as well as physical wellbeing. Should include in bullet "Sport and play space is important for supporting healthy lifestyles."</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>Within the plan consideration has been given to the importance of developing cultural and community infrastructure. An objective of the plan is to ensure that '<i>all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being to everyone including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space and green infrastructure</i>'. Within Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs developers are asked to make provision for a range of facilities including those for faith groups.</p> <p>The JSNA for New Communities highlights that there is a clear relationship between the amount and quality of green space in the living environment and peoples' health and well being. A minor change is proposed to recognise this in the list of key facts.</p>
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Amend bullet 9 to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport and play space is important for supporting healthy lifestyles <b><u>and improving both the physical and mental wellbeing of communities.</u></b></li> </ul>

## Policy SC/1: Allocation for Open Space

Note: See audit trail within Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy – Issue 7 Localism and Relationship with Neighbourhood Development Plans relating to proposals from Parish Council

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 90</b>	<b>Allocations for Open Space</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	Audit and Assessment of Open space in South Cambridgeshire 2012
<b>Existing policies</b>	Site Specific Policies DPD: SP/14 Allocations for Open Space
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>The Site Specific Policies DPD includes a number of land allocations for recreation. These were identified as a result of public consultation, and where opportunities were identified through previous plans. They are located in areas where open space assessments have identified a shortfall against standards. Their progress is monitored in the Annual Monitoring Report, and the latest assessment is outlined below:</p> <p>Extension to recreation grounds:</p> <p>1a. East of recreation ground, Over No known progress.</p> <p>1b. East of Bar Lane &amp; north-west of Green Hedge Farm, Stapleford The Parish Council has advised that whilst there are currently no proposals to bring forward the extension to the recreation ground, it would like the allocation to remain.</p> <p>1c. North of Hatton’s Road, Longstanton The Parish Council continues to work with the Council to bring forward this site as an extension to the recreation ground.</p> <p>1d. North of recreation ground, Swavesey The Parish Council has advised that whilst there are currently no proposals to bring forward the extension to the recreation ground, it would like the allocation to remain.</p> <p>1e. East of recreation ground, Impington The Parish Council has advised that when they have previously approached the landowner they have been told there is no possibility within the foreseeable future of them leasing or acquiring the land.</p> <p>Extension to school playing field:</p>

	<p>2f. Land at Primary School, Long Furlong, Over Planning permission was allowed on appeal for the erection of 28 dwellings and the provision of a playing field for Over Primary School in June 2007 (S/1114/06). The development has been completed. New recreation grounds:</p> <p>3g. East of Mill Lane, Impington The Parish Council has advised that there is currently no intention to bring forward this land for recreation uses.</p> <p>3h. South of Manor Park, Histon The Parish Council is currently in negotiation with Cambridgeshire County Council to secure a lease for use of this land for recreation.</p> <p>3i. Land at Barrowcroft, Gunns Lane, Histon The Parish Council has advised that there is currently no intention to bring forward this land for recreation uses.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> Alternatives are to maintain the allocations in the new Local Plan, or to not carry them forward.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	<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>
<b>Final Issues And Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 90:</b> <b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan carry forward the existing allocations for recreation and open space? <b>B:</b> Are there other areas that should be allocated?</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	<p>Identifies a range of sites for open space uses, that were identified in previous plans. All the sites located in areas where there is an existing shortage of space, and could therefore contribute to achieving a range of objectives similar to those identified with the general open space options. Given the time they have been allocated, there are question marks over the deliverability of some of the sites. A number of the site would require the loss of agricultural land.</p>
<b>Representations Received</b>	<p><b>Question 90A:</b> Support: 31, Object: 9, Comment: 5 <b>Question 90B:</b> Support: 4, Object: 0, Comment: 11</p>
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>Question 90A</b> <b>SUPPORT:</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support allocations including from 15 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Should be no reduction in allocation of open space.</li> <li>• Land north of Hatton's Rd, Longstanton - retains this allocation. To deliver this Local Plan must allocate housing land in village otherwise no funding</li> <li>• Support for allocation of land east of Bar Lane, Stapleford</li> <li>• Sawston – under provision so needs sites allocating</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land East of Mill Lane, Impington – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Histon and Impington is well served for sports facilities according to report</li> <li>▪ Street could not cope with increased traffic</li> <li>▪ Junction with Mill Lane dangerous</li> <li>▪ Would change character of road especially in dark – anti social behaviour; security</li> <li>▪ Existing play park within short walking distance that serves area</li> <li>▪ Larger sites more suitable</li> <li>▪ Loss of valuable agricultural land</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Land east of recreation ground, Over – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sufficient open space in village</li> <li>▪ Other sites available to extend playing fields</li> <li>▪ Land compulsory purchased for extension to playing fields – part used for non-playing field uses</li> <li>▪ Land ideal for housing development</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could make housing sites unviable</li> <li>• Swavesey -Land north of Recreation Ground <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site within Environment Agency Flood Plain and at risk from surface water flooding</li> <li>▪ Land essential to viability of farming enterprise. Any proposal to bring forward recreation use should be addressed alongside future of land to north (SHLAA site 169)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Histon and Impington Parish Council - Under provision of open space in these villages according to recreation study. 37% of recommended standard. Progress of sites - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land to south of Manor Park, Histon- planning application for change of use submitted/ land leased from County</li> <li>▪ None of other sites will be deliverable</li> <li>▪ Land next to existing Recreation Ground owned by Chivers Farms which will not become available</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Question 90B</b></p> <p><b>OTHER AREAS SUGGESTED FOR ALLOCATION:</b></p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Range of sites put forward for open space. Those that were appropriate were consulted upon in the Issues and Options 2 consultation in 2013.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All proposed areas are to the west and north of Cambridge. What about the rest? Fulbourn? Balsham? Shelford etc.</li> <li>Depends on extent other communities are eventually developed.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>The Local Plan will carry forward the allocation of sites included in Issue 90 except for those within Histon and Impington where an alternative site is being considered in the Issues and Options 2 consultation, as proposed by the Parish Council.</p> <p>Support for allocations including from 15 parish councils. Some objections to particular allocations - Land east of Mill Lane, Impington; Land east of recreation ground, Over and Land north of recreation ground, Swavesey. Both Over and Swavesey Parish Councils have supported the retention of the allocations.</p> <p>The updated open space assessment demonstrated a continued shortfall of open space in Over. The site is ideally placed for an extension of the existing recreation ground. Further residential allocations have not been proposed at Over, a Group Village. It is not a sustainable location for the scale of residential development proposed in the representation.</p> <p>The Swavesey site also offers an opportunity to extend the exiting village green. There is no evidence that additional residential development would be required to maintain viability of the farm unit.</p> <p>Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes sustainability appraisals of the existing open space allocations at Stapleford, Swavesey, Longstanton and Over that are being carried forward (see the 'Recreation and Open Space' section).</p>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/1: Allocations for Open Space

<b>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2) Issue 11</b>	<b>Recreation and Open Space</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	
<b>Existing policies</b>	None.
<b>Analysis</b>	A number of sites for new public open space have been suggested

	by Parish Councils. In all cases the options are in villages where there is a shortfall in provision against the Council's adopted (and proposed) standards for sport and play provision. Whilst the plan can allocate open space, delivery will be a matter for the Parish Council or other bodies.
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	<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>
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<b>Question 11:</b> Which of the site options for open space do you support or object to and why?
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	In order to provide comparison two options have been appraised, one considering general impacts or a review (yes), an another considering the impacts of not reviewing the green belt (no). The impacts of a Green Belt review are similar to those described in the development strategy options above. Development, depending on the scale and location, has potential for significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. There could also be impact on biodiversity objectives. However, given the best access to services and facilities will be on the edge of Cambridge, or in rural centres located in the green belt, this has the most potential to address sustainable travel objectives.
<b>Representations Received</b>	<p>R1: Land known as Bypass Farm, West of Cottenham Road, Histon Support: 48 Object: 2 Comment: 14</p> <p>R2: East of Railway Line, South of Granhams Road, Great Shelford Support: 54 Object: 0 Comment: 8</p> <p>R3: Grange Field, Church Street, Great Shelford Support: 55 Object: 0 Comment: 8</p> <p>R4: North of former EDF site, Ely Road, Milton Support: 39 Object: 0 Comment: 7</p>
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>R1: Land known as Bypass Farm, West of Cottenham Road, Histon</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to deliver recreation spaces;</li> <li>• Village currently under provided, particularly in northern part of village;</li> <li>• <b>Histon and Impington Parish Council</b> – Support allocation.</li> </ul>

	<p>Other alternatives undeliverable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Histon and Impington Village Action Group</b> – Need outdoor spaces for the community.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Potential for site to also enhance biodiversity.</li> <li>• <b>Sport England</b> – support in principle.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cottenham Road is busy 40mph road.</li> <li>• Impact on countryside views of adjoining property.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are good existing facilities near football club;</li> <li>• Could be better used for housing;</li> <li>• Needs appropriate ancillary facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>R2: East of Railway Line, South of Granhams Road, Great Shelford</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to have protected green spaces, which deliver opportunities for recreation;</li> <li>• Site is unsuitable for formal recreation because of its general appearance, its proximity to local housing, its potential impact on local roads, especially close to level crossing and the difficulty of providing on-site parking;</li> <li>• Encourage creation of nature reserves, not only for wildlife but for the pleasure of residents too;</li> <li>• Needs a 'green link' from Stapleford to the Magog Downs;</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Potential for site to also enhance biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Parish Council of Great Shelford seems to think the village ends at the railway bridge-why have they not considered land between Westfield/Stonehill?</li> <li>• Parking is already very well used-where would there be more parking?</li> <li>• <b>Sport England</b> – support in principle. Accept that this site may not be suitable for formal sport given its parkland setting.</li> </ul> <p><b>R3: Grange Field, Church Street, Great Shelford</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing playing field is an excellent community facility and well used to the point of overcrowding on occasions.</li> <li>• The Parish Council have been working to extend the recreational facilities of this growing and popular village. Grange</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>field is not used for agriculture and grazing at present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the Western boundary of existing recreation ground is a mature tree belt which partially screens the proposed site. In any development this tree belt must be maintained and ideally enhanced and expanding.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Potential for site to also enhance biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sport England</b> – support in principle. Assessment needed of impact on ancillary facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>R4: North of former EDF site, Ely Road, Milton</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to provide more recreation / green space;</li> <li>• Excellent to hear Parish Councils talking about such amenities;</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Potential for site to also enhance biodiversity.</li> <li>• <b>Milton Parish Council</b> - Support proposal for recreation land at former EDF site.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Milton already has good facilities;</li> <li>• <b>Sport England</b> – support in principle. Assessment needed of impact on ancillary facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>General Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 general supports for the options.</li> <li>• Delivery must be considered prior to any formal allocation. It is not acceptable for allocations to be made where delivery is not achievable.</li> <li>• Should be guided by the villages involved, and what the community wants;</li> <li>• Need to protect and enhance biodiversity;</li> <li>• Need new facilities in Fulbourn;</li> <li>• <b>Girton Parish Council:</b> It was questioned whether this would facilitate subsequent housing development on land thus removed from green belt.</li> <li>• <b>Dry Drayton Parish Council</b> – Dry Drayton also has a shortage of open space.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>Include allocations in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Sites are suitable for open space uses. South of Graham’s Road Great Shelford would only be suitable for informal recreation, and has limited potential for road access.</p> <p>It is not necessary to remove land from the Green Belt to deliver</p>

	<p>open space and recreation uses.</p> <p>Proposals were specifically put forward by Parish councils, and they will be responsible for delivery.</p> <p>Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes sustainability appraisals of each of the open space allocations that were subject to public consultation in Issues and Option 2013 (see the 'Recreation and Open Space' section).</p>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/1: Allocations for Open Space
<b>Policy SC/1: Allocation for Open Space (and paragraph 9.4 – 9.5)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 35</p> <p>Support: 11 (including 3 Parish Councils)</p> <p>Object: 24 (including 2 Parish Councils)</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environment Agency</b> – support allocating land for open space as it can be available for water storage now – perhaps more formally in future. Open space provides resilience to climate change- areas that can flood with minimal effect compared to occupied property. Green spaces to store excess surface water. Cambs Surface Water Management Plan sets out known hot spots. Support designations in following locations to be future formal flood storage areas – Great Shelford; Longstanton and Swavesey.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick Parish Council</b> – support policy</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Should amend policy to refer to Natural England's ANGSt standards as advocated in Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy.</li> <li>• <b>Swavesey and District Bridleways Association</b> and six individual respondents – policy should mention importance of leisure routes such as public bridleways – promotes health, leisure and transport network.</li> </ul> <p><b>Village allocations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SC/1:1a – Land east of recreation ground, Over</b> – Objection from landowners (The Ginn Trustees) – other land adjacent to playing fields should be used instead. No objection to half site being allocated even given substantial areas have already been compulsory purchased previously for playing fields</li> </ul>

	<p>but not all used for that purpose. Site allocated for many years – opportunity for resolution of matter as no proposals by District or Parish Councils. Representation also submitted for southern half of site to be allocated for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SC/1:1b - Land east of Bar Lane, Stapleford and west of the access road to Green Hedges Farm</b> Support for allocation</li> <li>• <b>SC/1:1d – Land north of recreation ground, Swavesey</b> Objection from landowner. Site rolled forward without consideration of alternatives. Land part of larger area next to village green. Could now expand village green in alternative directions. Need better distribution of open space within village – all at northern end. Swavesey linear village. Site unlikely to be deliverable during plan period. Should replace with alternative site to east or south of existing village</li> <li>• <b>SC/1:1e – Land at Grange Farm, Church Street, Great Shelford</b> Objection from landowners of field – land not accessible to public / not a village amenity. No consultation with owners by Parish Council who put forward site or District Council who included it in Issues and Option 2 consultation. Site not available. In private ownership. Objection as recreation ground is big enough- parts not fully used. Need for land for new housing. . Village in Recreation and Open Space Study 2013 found to be well provided for compared to other villages. Two new sites proposed in plan – over provision of open space Support for allocation from three respondents. (Separate representation received for site to be allocated for housing)</li> <li>• <b>SC/1:1f – Land north of former EDF site, Ely Road. Milton</b> Milton Parish Council support allocation.</li> <li>• <b>SC/1:2g – Land known as Bypass Farm, west of Cottenham Road, Histon</b> Objection to site from 7 respondents – not suitable site, too close to neighbouring properties, not needed in village, no consultation with those affected by it. Should look for alternative site. Likely to generate increased traffic on already busy road, not safe to cross road. Using green belt land. Land floods. Objection from landowners of site next to allocation – concern at</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>that site not suitable – wrong location for village. Support proposal but as part of proposal should reduce speed limit on B1049. Site car park should not be open 24/7 to minimise disturbance to local residents. Consider light pollution at night.</p> <p>Support from <b>Histon and Impington Parish Council</b> – confirmation from landowners that willing to sell land. Shortage of open space in village. PC has leafleted near neighbours and only three adverse comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SC/1:2h – Land south of Granham Road, Great Shelford. Great Shelford Parish Council</b> Support for allocation from 3 respondents. Separate representation received for southern part of site to be allocated for housing.</li> </ul> <p><b>New sites proposed in villages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fulbourn</b> <b>New site</b> - Field abutting existing recreation ground should be used as extension to recreation ground. Shortage of open space in village especially as much new housing proposed.</li> <li>• <b>Dry Drayton</b> <b>Dry Drayton Parish Council - New site</b> – Provision for a recreation ground of at least 2 acres as close to school as possible and a separate play area for community within the parish. Only village in district with no play area or recreation ground</li> <li>• <b>Graveley</b> <b>Graveley Parish Council – New site</b> – Need for informal recreation area in village – joint representation with Manor Farm for new housing with provision of green area.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The policy has been updated from one that was in the Adopted Site Specific Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. Sites where a parish council was no longer pursuing a proposal were not carried forward into the new policy. New sites have been included in the plan where put to us by parish councils in the Issues and Options consultations. These allocations took into account where there is an identified shortage of existing provision.</p> <p>Objections have been received from the landowners to three of the open space allocations in the plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site 1a, Over— Site carried forward from previous plan. Allocation is located adjacent to the village recreation</li> </ol>

ground and would form a logical extension to the existing facility. The landowner has suggested that half the site should be allocated for housing however this site was considered as part of work on the SHLAA (Site 182) and rejected as having potential for residential development.

2. Site1d, Swavesey — Site carried forward from previous plan. Allocation provides an opportunity for open space provision within the village.
3. Site 1e, Great Shelford – A new allocation which is adjacent to an existing recreation ground and would provide a convenient extension to this facility. A separate representation has been made to allocate the site for housing. The Recreation and Open Space Study 2013 recognises that there is a shortage of such open space in Great Shelford.

It is noted that these landowners do not support the parish councils' aspirations but the plan includes these proposals as ones to be pursued by these parish councils to meet identified local shortfalls in provision.

A new site proposed in Histon ( Site 2g) in the plan has received objections from local residents concerned about the location of the open space on the edge of the village, on a busy road and on the impact it may have to adjoining residents. There is potential to address these issues through appropriate site design and siting of any facilities. This site is being actively progressed by the parish council.

An open space allocation proposed at Granhams Farm, Great Shelford (Site 2h) has had a representation for the southern part to be allocated for housing – although no representation was submitted objecting to the open space allocation. There is a recognised need for additional open space within the village in the Recreation and Open Space Study 2013.

The open space policy is site specific and therefore the suggestion that public bridleways be mentioned as leisure routes is not appropriate to this policy This matter is considered in other parts of the plan notably Policy TI/2: Planning for Sustainable Transport and Policy NH/6: Green Infrastructure

Natural England had suggested that the policy should refer to the ANGSt standards (Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard) which had been used in preparing the Green Infrastructure Strategy for county. The Council has used its own open space standard for

	<p>green space in preparing the plan. A minor change is proposed to include mention within the supporting text that the Council has carried out an update of the Recreation and Open Space Study 2005. This was published in July 2013. The study investigates current quantity and quality of provision of open space within the district and how this is meeting local need, and utilises these assessments to review the local standard of provision developed from the 2005 study. This local standard was devised after considering other existing standards such as the ANGSt one.</p> <p>Dry Drayton is recognised in this study as having a lack of open space and during the latest consultation the parish council has submitted a request that a site be found in the village. No specific site has been put forward for inclusion in the plan but the Council is happy to work with the parish council outside of the plan making process to deliver open space within the village.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Amend paragraph 9.4 to read:  <u><b>'The Council has published an updated Recreation and Open Space Study 2013. This has provided information on the provision of open space within the district and how this is meeting local need. As a result of this review</b></u> sites for open space and recreation uses have been carried forward from the previous Plan .....</p> <p>Further amendments have been made to paragraph 9.31 to refer to the Recreation and Open Space Study 2013.</p>

**Policy SC/2: Health Impact Assessment**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 80</b></p>	<p><b>Health Impact Assessment</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<p>South Cambridgeshire Health Impact Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (2011)</p>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD: DP/1 Sustainable Development</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>Spatial planning and development has the potential to impact on human health and wellbeing. This is because a wide range of social and environmental factors affect the health of local communities within South Cambridgeshire. Good health is related to good quality housing and developments, well designed street scenes, well laid out neighbourhoods, quality and efficiency in transport systems, opportunities to experience leisure and cultural services activities and green and open space. Ensuring these issues are considered at the planning and design stage can improve both the physical and mental health of the population.</p> <p>Health Impact Assessments (HIA) are designed to check whether a proposal might reinforce health inequalities, or inadvertently damage people's health in its widest sense. Health impact Assessment is a process recommended by the World Health Organisation, and the Department of Health</p> <p>Existing policy requires assessments to be submitted alongside proposals for major developments (above 20 dwellings or 1000m<sup>2</sup> of commercial development) to provide an assessment, tailored to the scale and nature of the development.</p> <p>HIA is most effective on major developments. An issue for the plan to consider is whether the threshold should be raised. This could reduce the burden on developers of smaller schemes, whilst health impact could still be addressed through sustainability, and design and access statements.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> To ensure that new developments have a positive impact on the health and well-being of new and existing residents, the Local Plan could continue to require Health Impact Assessments (HIA) of major development proposals. However, HIA is most effective on large scale developments, and smaller developments can be sufficiently addressed in sustainability and design and access statements. An option for the Local Plan could be to include a higher threshold when an HIA is required.</p>

<p><b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b></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><b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b></p>	<p><b>Question 80:</b>  <b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan continue to seek Health Impact Assessments (HIA) to accompany major development proposals?  <b>B:</b> Should the threshold when HIA are required:  i. Remain at 20 or more dwellings or 1,000m<sup>2</sup> floorspace; or  ii. Be raised to 100 or more dwellings, or 5,000m<sup>2</sup> floorspace.</p>
<p><b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b></p>	<p>The clear aim of the option is to support delivery of the health objective. There are wider benefits through its implementation to other objectives, by ensuring the built environment is good for people. Raising the threshold when they are required (option Bii) would mean less developments would be required to prepare an HIA, but given the evidence that appraisals are most effective on larger developments, and if issues for smaller developments are adequately addressed by other mechanisms, the difference would not be significant.</p>
<p><b>Representations Received</b></p>	<p><b>Question 80A:</b> Support: 28, Object: 0, Comment: 2  <b>Question 80Bi:</b> Support: 19, Object: 2, Comment: 2  <b>Question 80B ii:</b> Support: 10, Object: 2</p>
<p><b>Key Issues from Representations</b></p>	<p><b>Question 80A</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should not have a negative impact on a village</li> <li>• Support from 17 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Assessment essential even for 20 dwellings.</li> <li>• Health and wellbeing issues are key for people to living long and quality lives.</li> <li>• NHS Cambridgeshire support policy</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HIAs relevant to large developments but not for smaller ones</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 80Bi</b></p>

	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support including 15 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Developments always need to consider the wellbeing of residents</li> <li>• Any impact however small needs to be assessed.</li> <li>• Yes - for small developments located on known contaminated land or adjacent to polluting sites or roads</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NHS Cambridgeshire states that full HIA may not be practical for such small developments where most significant impacts may be in construction phase. Suggests alternative 'Rapid Impact Assessment' - less intensive but could identify if further assessment needed.</li> <li>• HIA irrelevant in smaller developments. Threshold should be 150 dwellings or more</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 80Bii</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support including 3 Parish Councils</li> <li>• For HIA to be worthwhile should only be on major developments. HIA for smaller sites do not add to robust planning application submission.</li> <li>• Threshold for EIA is 200 dwellings - make sense to be in line.</li> <li>• Could have exceptions for smaller developments located on known contaminated land or adjacent to polluting sites or roads.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seems sensible to have HIA for smaller sites</li> <li>• Raise threshold to 150 dwellings because HIA irrelevant on smaller developments.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remain at 20 or more unless this puts a burden on planning system.</li> <li>• Must be adequate community facilities in countryside for indoor and outdoor active recreation.</li> <li>• Existing pressures on Cambridgeshire's existing facilities – does HIA correctly predict requirements of population?</li> <li>• NHS Cambridgeshire – Timely to review HIA SPD. New toolkits available for assessment work.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>Continue to include a policy to seek Health Impact Assessments retaining the existing threshold of 20 or more dwellings or 1,000m<sup>2</sup> , but the wording should state that a HIA is required that is appropriate to the scale of the development. This would allow more flexibility and rapid impact assessments could be carried out</p>

	<p>on smaller developments that meet the threshold.</p> <p>Support for continuing to ask for a HIA including support from 17 parish councils and from NHS Cambridgeshire. Support from 15 parish councils for keeping existing threshold.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By allowing flexibility within the policy this will allow for different levels of detail within HIA depending on the scale of the development. A rapid impact assessment could pick up if a small development is having a greater impact than expected and allows for more detail assessment to be carried out.</li> <li>• HIA SPD is to be reviewed to reflect new toolkits available to do assessment work.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/2: Health Impact Assessment
<b>Policy SC/2: Health Impact Assessment (and paragraphs 9.6 – 9.8)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 14 (including 2 Parish Councils) Support: 3 Object: 11
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – support policy. Need for consistent approach across Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Parish Council</b> – support policy</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick Parish Council</b> – support</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Swavesey and District Bridleway Association</b> and six respondents – policy should mention importance of leisure routes such as public bridleways – promotes health, leisure and transport network.</li> <li>• Objection – HIA adds no value to decision making process – all health related issues covered by sustainable development considerations/ other policies in the plan. Should only be required for EIA developments.</li> <li>• <b>House Builders Federation</b> – Policy unnecessary. Contrary to paragraph 122 in NPPF. Delete policy.</li> <li>• Unreasonable for guidance on HIA to be delayed until SPD – clarification needed as to whether existing SPD still valid?</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The policy has been amended from a similar one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The policy has been revised to allow for two levels of HIA depending on the scale of the development proposed so that smaller developments need now only carry out a rapid HIA. An SPD on Health Impact Assessments (HIA) was adopted by the Council in March 2011 which provided additional detailed guidance on the implementation of the adopted HIA policy.</p> <p>The Council considers there is a need to provide such a policy in the plan as it provides a method of considering the impacts of development on the health of different groups in the population. The Council will review the SPD within the lifetime of the plan</p> <p>The importance of the value of public bridleways as leisure routes are too detailed a matter to include within the actual policy and is covered in other parts of the plan.</p>
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<b>No change</b>

**Policy SC/3: Protection of Village Services and Facilities**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 81</b></p>	<p><b>Protection of Village Services and Facilities</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<p>Village Services and Facilities Study 2012</p>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD: SF/1 Protection of village services and facilities</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>One of the Council’s corporate aims is to play our part in improving rural services.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 70) states that planning policies should ‘guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs.’</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report identified that many villages, particularly smaller villages, have a limited range of services and facilities, and limited public transport services. Surveys Conducted by Cambridgeshire ACRE also show service availability has already declined in some areas.</p> <p>If a local service or facility is lost to a settlement it will have an impact not only that particular local community but also to any smaller villages within its catchment. The value to the community of having local facilities may not be reflected in the commercial value of the property and policies are needed to ensure the value of such facilities is fully considered when considering proposals for more commercially valuable uses such as housing.</p> <p>The Local Plan needs to protect local services and facilities where the loss would cause an unacceptable reduction in the level of service provision in the locality. It needs to establish the issues that will be considered in determining the significance of the loss.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b></p> <p>It would not be a reasonable option to have no policy, as it could harm sustainability of settlements, and would be contrary to the NPPF. Alternatives exist regarding the tests applied to considering significance of the loss, and the facilities that are addressed.</p> <p>The current plan requires consideration of the established use and its potential contribution to local amenity, the presence and accessibility of alternatives, and the future economic viability (established by 12 months marketing). Alternative tests could be applied setting more detailed evidence requirements, providing greater detail on the quality of evidence required.</p>

<p><b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b></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><b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b></p>	<p><b>Question 81:</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan seek to continue to protect where possible local services and facilities such as village shops, pubs, post offices, libraries, community meeting places, health centres or leisure facilities?</p> <p><b>B:</b> Are there any other services and facilities that should be included?</p> <p><b>C:</b> Should the Local Plan include the alternative more detailed and stringent tests proposed in Issue 81 for determining when an alternative use should be permitted?</p> <p><b>D:</b> If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?</p>
<p><b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b></p>	<p>The option regarding protection of village services and facilities would aim to preserve access to services and facilities, contributing to the redressing inequalities objective by ensuring those less able to travel can access amenities. Local facilities contribute to the economy, and also the way spaces work by providing a mix of uses. Alternative tests outlined in the option would provide an alternative means of achieving the same goals, although the scale of the additional benefit is not clear.</p>
<p><b>Representations Received</b></p>	<p><b>Question 81A:</b> Support: 69, Object: 0, Comment: 5  <b>Question 81B:</b> Support: 4, Object: 1, Comment: 26  <b>Question 81C:</b> Support: 27, Object: 5, Comment: 4  <b>Question 81D:</b> Support: 0, Object: 0, Comment: 4</p>
<p><b>Key Issues from Representations</b></p>	<p><b>Question 81A</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 27 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• Local post office has many roles – meeting place; advice centre; bank – gives life to village. Once gone likely not to be replaced. Village then loses its sense of community and just becomes a collection of houses.</li> <li>• Without local facilities people have to use their cars resulting in increased road traffic.</li> <li>• Policy should be aware of additional costs and should not seek</li> </ul>

	<p>to impose undue cost burden on development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support but if services do not have funding, make profit or underused they are unlikely to survive</li> <li>• Should link policy to Business Rates so lower rate from small local independent shops.</li> <li>• Need to protect local services for those with limited mobility. Shop/ pub are important meeting places so people do not feel isolated within community.</li> <li>• Cuts in funding to buses and some households not having access to a car creates isolation especially for elderly.</li> <li>• Ageing population will need access to services – local plan must meet their needs</li> <li>• Need to create community asset register as part of policy</li> <li>• Recognition by Cambridge City Council that South Cambs residents use high order services and facilities in city and that as population grows there will be increased demand for provision within City.</li> <li>• County Council support establishment of community hubs where shared provision</li> <li>• Cambridge Past, Present and Future – NPPF protects former pubs from redevelopment. Need to apply stringent tests to establish viability of pub so not lost to community. Need to consider co-location of local facilities</li> <li>• To maintain local facilities need to have sufficient population in a village – therefore need to allow small scale residential allocations to provide critical mass. Growth essential to maintain local services.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 81B</b></p> <p><b>SUGGESTED OTHER SERVICES / FACILITIES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestions for additional services and facilities made from 16 parish councils. Includes youth centres, open spaces, religious establishments, banks and cash points; NHS dental practices; arts venues, post boxes, prescription delivery services, residential and nursing care homes, children’s homes, community café, nurseries, doctors, bus stops and shelters.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 81C</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 14 parish councils.</li> <li>• Parish Councils should be consulted for local context</li> <li>• Places of worship used by community for different activities and if it is put to another use this is lost</li> <li>• If facility is last of its kind in village community should be offered support and time to make alternative arrangements for</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>preservation of service by community/ other party.</p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County Council question whether alternative test is applicable to all local services. For library service better to do community impact assessment.</li> <li>• Facility must have value in use to remain viable. Growth in population is essential to maintain local services. Policy restrictions do not ensure business will survive but could result in derelict village centres- if cannot find alternative use building may remain empty. Retain existing criteria.</li> <li>• Council should not put onerous conditions on owners of these facilities when they need to be marketed. – should not interfere with price to be marketed.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tests should not be detrimental to owner of business – 12 months of a failing business that must be put on market to meet criteria is not good idea</li> <li>• Marketing facility for 12months not long enough in current economic climate. Once facility is gone it is less likely to return.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 81D</b></p> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local services and facilities must be maintained. A local needs survey would be useful to see what residents want</li> <li>• Important distinction between commercial enterprise and non-profit making venue like village community shop</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>To continue to include a policy in the Local Plan protecting village services and facilities but to make some amendments to it such as widening the range of services covered by it and to amend the tests that will be used.</p> <p>There was wide support for the policy but recognition that if services do not make a profit or are underused they are unlikely to survive.</p> <p>In order for more services to be included within the scope of the policy the following have been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add 'banks' which are currently not included.</li> <li>• Change 'community meeting places' to 'community buildings and meeting places' – this would then include youth centres / scout huts / religious establishments.</li> <li>• Change 'health centres' to 'health facilities' – this would then cover doctors' surgery, dentists.</li> </ul>

	<p>There was support for including additional tests within the policy. One has been added that takes into account what existing spare capacity in alternative facilities there are within a village and how the remaining uses will manage if the facility under threat goes. Also there is clarification of what we as a Council expect for economic viability for the 12 month test.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By including a policy in the Local Plan the Council is recognising the importance of retaining services within a village and their value as meeting places. A single building may have a multi-functional value to a village and its disappearance would affect a cross section of the population.</li> <li>• The tests provide a reasonable balance, providing opportunities for services to be retained, whilst allowing their loss when this is appropriately demonstrated not to be possible or appropriate.</li> <li>• The development strategy included in the Local Plan is one that promotes development in the settlements within the district that are the most sustainable. Whilst recognising that increasing housing provision within a settlement may mean there are some more people living in this community to use a shop or pub it does not necessarily increase the overall viability of the service.</li> <li>• The Council would wish to encourage the sharing of facilities if this increases the use and viability of a particular building.</li> <li>• The Community Asset Register is a separate process to the local plan.</li> <li>• Of the suggested additional services or facilities to be included within the policy some are already protected by the existing policy wording - religious establishments; others are protected under other policies - open space and allotments. Others are outside of the scope of planning – prescription service; bus service. It is also relevant to recognise that permitted development rights will allow a change of use of some services and facilities to another without planning permission e.g. a pub to change into a restaurant, and therefore such changes would be out of the scope of the policy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b></p>	<p>Policy SC/3: Protection of Village Services and Facilities</p>

<b>Policy SC/3: Protection of Village Services and Facilities (and paragraph 9.9)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 11 Support: 7 including 2 parish councils Object: 4 including 2 parish councils.
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Campaign for Real Ale</b> – pleased to see inclusion of public houses in policy.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> – Support policy. Particular attention should be paid to retaining pubs.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Parish Council</b> – support policy as it protects character of village</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick Parish Council</b> - support for policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn Parish Council</b> – supports policy. Services often focal point for surrounding community. Important that parish councils are formally consulted with respect to section 2 (a) and (b). Also as part of policy the Council should promote Community Asset Register.</li> <li>• <b>Barrington Parish Council</b> – policies in chapter 9 relate to large scale developments. Insufficient mention of day to day needs of Group Villages. Plan not protecting further erosion of facilities and services in villages particularly public transport, education and health services. Not considering increased demand and diminishing capacity of existing provision.</li> <li>• <b>The Theatres Trust</b> – policy does not refer to cultural infrastructure – should add cultural buildings to section 1 of policy to reflect paragraph 28 bullet 4 in NPPF.</li> <li>• Support policy but term ‘village service’ should explicitly cover educational provision such as local primary schools. New housing development in existing villages will generate extra burden on local schools – need for new provision to provide for that development.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	The policy has been reviewed from a similar one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. As a result of the review additional services have been included in section 1 of the policy. The list in this section gives an indication of the sort of village services that will be covered by the policy. If these services were to be lost it would cause an unacceptable reduction in provision

	<p>within the village. The Theatres Trust suggests that cultural buildings should be added to comply with the NPPF however this list is not intended to include all possible services and does not need to repeat guidance already in the NPPF.</p> <p>Other respondents have requested that educational facilities; public transport and health facilities should be included in the policy. Health facilities are already listed. Education provision is the responsibility of the County Council and the plan has included a specific policy to cover education facilities. (Policy TI/9:). The future provision of public transport is being considered in the County's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and it is outside the remit of the planning system to ensure future services are continued or new ones introduced to villages within the district. In allocating new housing sites in the most sustainable locations the Council has endeavoured to ensure public transport is available for the residents of these new developments.</p> <p>The policy applies to all scales of villages within the district and not just the larger settlements. Smaller villages will have few facilities which are important to be protected so that the day-to-day needs of a community can meet.</p> <p>The Council keeps a 'List of Assets of Community Value' as required under the Localism Act 2011 and this is referred to in paragraph 9.3. A modification is proposed to add to the supporting text to highlight those local facilities valued by the local community can be added to this list.</p> <p>The Council will use local knowledge including that from Parish Councils for determining the matters in section 2 of the policy.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Add to the end of paragraph 9.9:  <u><b>'The local community can highlight the facilities it values within its parish by applying for them to be included on the register of Community Assets held by the Council.'</b></u></p>

**Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 82</b></p>	<p><b>Developing New Communities</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<p>Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth</p>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Control Policies DPD: DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments.</li> <li>• Also addressed in Area Action Plans.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 69) states that Local planning authorities should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see.</p> <p>The option put forward in the issues and options report identifies the objectives that should be applied to new developments in the district. It has been guided by principles established by existing area action plans for major sites such as Northstowe (which were developed with community involvement), the principles established the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth, and issues raised in the early round of stakeholder workshops.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: None.</b></p> <p>The local plan needs to address the needs of new communities, and the issues and options consultation provides an opportunity for community input regarding the principles that should be applied.</p>
<p><b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b></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><b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b></p>	<p><b>Question 82:</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> Do you agree with the principles of service provision in Issue 82?</p> <p><b>B:</b> If not, why not? What alternative issues do you think should be included?</p>

<p><b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b></p>	<p>New communities will generate a wide range of needs, and provision of services and facilities to meet these will clearly have significant positive impact on a range of objectives, in particular access to services, health and redressing inequalities. The principles directly reflected a number of objectives, and this is reflected in the significant positive impacts identified. There are also benefits to sustainable travel, meaning people have to travel less to access services.</p>
<p><b>Representations Received</b></p>	<p><b>Question 82A:</b> Support: 30, Object: 1, Comment: 4  <b>Question 82B:</b> Support: 0, Object: 0, Comment: 3</p>
<p><b>Key Issues from Representations</b></p>	<p><b>Question 82A</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to plan for facilities in new developments</li> <li>• Developers aware of need for provision</li> <li>• Support from 12 parish councils</li> <li>• Policy should follow general guidance laid down by NPPF</li> <li>• Need timely provision of facilities especially health, retail and transport</li> <li>• S Cambs District Council experienced in creating new communities</li> <li>• Natural England want policy to ensure non-vehicular access is promoted for people to access services including Green Infrastructure. GI should be requirement of new development as identified in Cambridgeshire GI Strategy.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy restrictions do not ensure businesses survive or are created. Need growth in population to ensure facilities are used and retained</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If families move into an area need more sports centres / green spaces for team sports/ playgrounds for children and youth centres</li> <li>• Cambridgeshire County Council comments that need to define term 'Community Services' in Local Plan. Should include library service and Household Recycling Centres...Provision of these to be included in CIL.</li> <li>• Little confidence from experience of past that District Council will provide adequate services for new communities. Major developments in an area impact adversely on quality of life of existing residents.</li> <li>• Need to include existing residents in community development</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 82B</b></p>

	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of community facilities fosters community spirit therefore should be provided at earliest opportunity</li> <li>• New communities should be parished at beginning of new settlement</li> <li>• Should provide burial grounds in new developments</li> <li>• Needs of different groups must be considered in provision of services.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>The Local Plan should be based on the principles for service and facility provision as set out in Issue 82. Consideration should be given to existing residents from an area when developing a new community.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Open Space Study explored the issue regarding the provision of burial grounds and the difficulty of setting a specific standard. Major developments or new settlements will need to specifically investigate need for burial grounds and crematoria to serve the development and make appropriate provision or contributions</li> <li>• All new development will have to contribute to green infrastructure within the district and this is set out in a policy in the Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment chapter. Projects within South Cambridgeshire involve improving rights of way in particular areas.</li> <li>• Community services should include at an early stage places where the people can meet for both existing residents of an area and newcomers in the new housing. The policy specifically addresses community involvement and development.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issues 83, 85 and 86</b>	<b>Provision of sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities, Ice Rink and Concert Hall</b>
<b>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1) Question 8</b>	
<b>Key evidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2006)</li> <li>• Arts and Cultural Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2006)</li> </ul>

<b>Existing policies</b>	Development Control Policies DPD: DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>The concept of an ice rink emerged a few years ago and was first referred to in the Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (2006, prepared by Cambridgeshire Horizons) which identified gaps in sports provision within the Cambridge Sub-region. Analysis showed that there is demand for a facility and proposals have been developed by a group known as Cambridge Leisure Ice Centre (CLIC). The Major Sports Facilities Strategy recommended that an ice rink is developed with a vision to provide an ice centre which offers a range of ice based activities (ice hockey, public skating, figure skating, curling etc) with a focus on providing opportunities for community, local clubs and the University.</p> <p>CLIC have looked at various locations including North West Cambridge, Cambourne and West Cambridge but no firm proposals have been put forward.</p> <p>The concept of a concert hall also emerged a few years ago in the context of growth in the Cambridge area and was first referred to in the Arts and Cultural Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (2006, prepared by Cambridgeshire Horizons) which identified gaps in arts and cultural provision within the Cambridge Sub-region. The analysis found that although there is a wide range of music venues at the small and medium scale in and around Cambridge, there is a growing interest in testing the case for a purpose built auditorium for large scale music. Cambridge East was suggested as a possible location for a purpose built concert hall. Whilst the proposal has not yet been taken forward, it is appropriate for the Issues and Options consultation to explore the issue</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b></p> <p>The Local Plan could include provision for an ice rink or concert hall and develop an appropriate policy. Any provision would be subject to proven need and support for such a facility as well as finding a suitable location. As this facility would serve the whole of the Cambridge Sub-Region, this location may not necessarily be in South Cambridgeshire.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	<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</p>

	<p>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><b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b></p>	<p><b>Issues and Options 2012</b></p> <p><b>Question 83:</b>  <b>A:</b> Is there a need for any other sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities that should be considered through the Local Plan Review?  <b>B:</b> If there is a need, what type and size of facility should they be?  <b>C:</b> If there is a need, where is the most appropriate location?</p> <p><b>Question 85:</b>  <b>A:</b> Is there a need for an ice rink in or near to Cambridge?  <b>B:</b> If there is a need, where should it be located?</p> <p><b>Question 86:</b>  <b>A:</b> Is there a need for a concert hall in or near to Cambridge?  <b>B:</b> If there is a need, where should it be located?</p> <p><b>Issues and options 2013 (Part 1)</b></p> <p><b>Question 8:</b>  <b>A:</b> Rather than identifying specific sites, should the Local Plans include a general policy to assist the consideration of any proposals for sub regional facilities such as ice rinks and concert halls, should they come forward?  <b>B:</b> Are the right principles identified? If not, what should be included?</p> <p>Paragraphs 10.14 to 10.17</p>
<p><b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b></p>	<p>Issue 83 - As there are no specific proposals, an assessment has not been completed.</p> <p>Issue 85 - This appraisal considers the inclusion of an ice rink proposal in the Local Plan. An Ice Rink would require land, and therefore has a potentially negative impact on minimising loss of undeveloped land, but this, like impact on many objectives, would depend on the location identified. Positive contribution towards community involvement, health, and economic objectives. Impact</p>

	<p>on transport objectives is uncertain, as it would depend on the location selected.</p> <p>Issue 86 - This appraisal considers the inclusion of a concert hall proposal in the Local Plan. A concert hall would require land, and therefore has a potentially negative impact on minimising loss of undeveloped land, but this, like impact on many objectives, would depend on the location identified. There would be a positive contribution towards community involvement and economic objectives. Impact on transport objectives is uncertain, as it would depend on the location selected.</p>
<p><b>Representations Received</b></p>	<p><b>Issues and Options 2012</b></p> <p><b>Question 83:</b></p> <p><b>A.</b> Is there a need for any other sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities that should be considered through the Local Plan Review? (<b>S: 11, O: 6, C: 16</b>)</p> <p><b>B.</b> If there is a need, what type and size of facility should they be? (<b>S: 0, O: 0, C: 9</b>)</p> <p><b>C.</b> If there is a need, where is the most appropriate location? (<b>S: 0, O: 0, C: 12</b>)</p> <p><b>Question 85:</b></p> <p><b>A.</b> Is there a need for an ice rink in or near to Cambridge? (<b>S: 22, O: 7, C: 10</b>)</p> <p><b>B.</b> If there is a need, where should it be located? (<b>S: 12, O: 0, C: 5</b>)</p> <p><b>A818</b></p> <p><b>Question 86:</b></p> <p><b>A.</b> Is there a need for a Concert Hall in or near to Cambridge? (<b>S: 10, O: 12, C: 8</b>)</p> <p><b>B.</b> If there is a need, where should it be located? (<b>S: 9, O: 1, C: 8</b>)</p> <p><b>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1)</b></p> <p><b>Question 8:</b></p> <p><b>A.</b> Rather than identifying specific sites, should the Local Plans include a general policy to assist the consideration of any proposals for sub regional facilities such as ice rinks and concert halls, should they come forward? (<b>S: 32, O: 12, C: 14</b>)</p> <p><b>B.</b> Are the right principles identified? If not, what should be included? (<b>S: 28, O: 4, C: 15</b>)</p> <p>Paragraphs 10.14 to 10.17 (<b>S: 39, O: 3, C: 8</b>)</p>

**Key Issues from Representations**

**Issues and Options 2012**

**Question 83:**

**A.** Is there a need for any other sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities that should be considered through the Local Plan Review?

- Cambridge region is under served for sporting facilities - need to review existing facilities and identify gaps.
- Need for a range of facilities and space (including multi-purpose sporting facilities), resulting in health benefits and well-being of local populace plus a boost to local sports teams.
- South Cambs is not a place for sub-regional centre of any description – does not have the transport infrastructure, locals do not want a football stadium.
- Need to take account of parking and public transport issues.
- Need for policy to both protect existing facilities from development pressures and to provide new or enhanced facilities where possible.

**B.** If there is a need, what type and size of facility should they be?

- New major conference venue
- Concert Hall
- Community Sports Centre
- Stadium, with space for up to 10,000 crowd
- New Crematorium
- Marina
- BMX Arena
- Swimming Pools
- Astro turf facility for hockey and tennis
- CamToo Project – City Local Plan already recognised this project which crosses the City / South Cambs boundary and so should be included in South Cambs Local Plan.
- Should be identified at village level by village plans

**C.** If there is a need, where is the most appropriate location?

- On the fringes of the City, the northern fringe or in the south, adjacent to the M11, at Trumpington.
- Accessible to as many residents as possible - near a park and ride site / site with good cycling links.
- Amongst the population it is intended to serve – in heart of that population – so that users of the stadium can walk to it.
- Northstowe and any other new settlements included in future policy (e.g. Waterbeach Barracks).
- Within the City (as there is no need in South Cambs).
- Chesterton Fen – site previously designated as a reprocessing plant.
- Consider sites at Waterbeach, part of M11 approach (North 2014) and the University site at Maddingley Road. Annex A – Audit Trail
- Swimming pool – Cambridge West site, Northstowe or existing large village?
- Cambourne – indoor swimming pool.

<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>Do not include a policy, but instead provide supporting text.</p> <p>There are a number of facilities some of sub regional significance, which have struggled to find space within Cambridge. Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council recognise that delivering such facilities within the sub-region is desirable, but are not satisfied that a compelling case exists for the need for a community stadium or other facilities in a Green Belt location. Any proposals would be considered on an exceptional basis, and would have to demonstrate there is a need, and they comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular the sequential approach to town centre uses, and other policies in the Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b></p>	<p>Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs</p>
<p><b>Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs ( and paragraph 9.10 – 9.15) excludes paragraphs relating to sub-regional facilities including Community Stadium</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b></p>	<p>Total: 34  Support : 6 (including 2 Parish Councils )  Object: 28 (including 3 Parish Councils )</p>
<p><b>Main Issues</b></p>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Campaign for Real Ale</b> – support policy including public houses in list of commercial facilities important to community life (section 4 f)</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – welcome libraries mentioned</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Parish Council</b> – support policy</li> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> – support policy new services and facilities in new developments must be done in timely fashion – at early stage of development / not neglected</li> <li>• General support for policy</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Homes and Communities Agency</b> – mismatch of policies as set out in adopted Northstowe Area Action Plan (NAAP) and draft policy. Need for clarity. Will new policy supersede older ones in NAAP? Suggested amended wording for Policy SC/4 to clarify</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – JSNA New Communities Report should be referenced in plan. Importance to plan for social infrastructure. Infrastructure Study in section on social infrastructure only sets out physical requirements for social facilities and omits reference to community development</li> </ul>

	<p>resources needed to development community cohesion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – still outstanding requirement for Household Recycling Centre in area. Also need to clarify that for waste and recycling provision that this includes both HRCs and bring sites as set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste Core Strategy and the RECAP Waste Management Guide - Propose amending wording to 4(i)</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – amend policy to include options whereby if land is required to provide for existing or future community or education services then site may come forward for mixed- use development (including residential) where there is an enabling development argument.</li> <li>• <b>Harston Parish Council</b> – insufficient information for other needs than housing of a community – future school provision; health and social care; lack of proposals for other amenities such as shops, pubs and village halls, sports and children’s facilities; no mention of future governance – need for new parish council.</li> <li>• <b>Cambourne and Caldecote Parish Councils</b> – amend policy by adding to range of services to be provided – allotments and youth and older people’s services/facilities. Also need new section in policy about Community Governance – ‘parishing’ of new communities.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council</b> – insufficient weight given to role faith facilities play in providing for needs of wider community. Key component in creating community. Little reference to a place of worship or religious instruction.</li> <li>• <b>The Theatre Trust</b> – policy does not include reference to cultural infrastructure – need to add cultural buildings to those listed in section 4 to reflect NPPF paragraph 28.</li> <li>• Swavesey and District Bridleway Association and eight respondents – policy should mention importance of leisure routes such as public bridleways – promote healthy, leisure and transport network.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> - List of services and facilities to be provided should include adequate green open space with playing fields, green infrastructure and children’s playground.</li> <li>• <b>House Builders Federation</b> – policy conflicts with paragraphs 203 - 206 in NPPF. Council may seek financial payments to range of services listed through CIL but not planning obligation.</li> <li>• Requirement for new developments to provide for provision of faith groups and burials is unreasonable and unjustified.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Better provided for at district level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New development must provide sufficient additional local educational infrastructure for new population. Need to consider full impact on existing schools.</li> <li>• Council should ensure free home shopping deliveries are provided by major supermarkets on major new developments to reduce unnecessary car journeys.</li> <li>• Need for doctor's surgery in Hardwick or Caldecote.</li> </ul> <p><b>New policy on healthcare provision.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – recommend that Cambridge City and S Cambs jointly agree policy on health care facilities. Cambridge City has explicit policy – Policy 75 which recognises the changing way in which health services may be delivered.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The policy is a new one relating to providing guidance on meeting the needs of the community for all scales of future housing development within the district – previously such guidance had only been set out in Area Action Plans (AAP) for new large scale growth areas such as Northstowe or on the extensions to Cambridge.</p> <p>Clarity has been sought by the Homes and Community Agency as to the role the existing policies in AAPs as opposed to the community needs policy in the plan. The Northstowe AAP remains part of the statutory development plan for South Cambridgeshire alongside the Local Plan. The Proposed Submission Local Plan clarifies at Appendix B that only Policy NS/3 (1g) is superseded by the Local Plan. Within the AAP Policy NS/9: Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Arts and Culture is specific to the needs of the new town of Northstowe. The Local Plan will include more recently adopted policies and the Council will weigh the appropriate weight to give to individual policies in both plans in determining any applications for Northstowe.</p> <p>Section 4 of the policy contains a comprehensive list of the range of services and facilities that should be provided for a development and already includes both education and health facilities. Some suggestions have been made for additions to this list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested by Cambourne and Caldecote Parish Councils the 'Provision of Youth and older people's services / facilities'. The policy provides a general list. Facilities needed by specific groups would be covered within this list. It would not therefore be necessary to highlight the needs of particular groups within the community.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The open space requirements including allotment and wider leisure/ green infrastructure provision of new developments are not considered in this section as other policies within the plan set out such requirements (e.g. Policy NH/ 6:Green infrastructure and Policy SC/7: Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments).</li> <li>• The needs for bridleways would be more appropriate in the transport chapter. Amendments have been made to Policy TI/2 under separate representations to incorporate the need to consider routes for horse riders</li> <li>• The Theatres Trust has requested that cultural buildings be included to comply with the NPPF and a minor change is proposed to meet this request.</li> <li>• The County Council's suggested amendment to the waste and recycling provision within section 4 is not considered necessary as the policy wording is flexible/ inclusive enough to cover this matter.</li> </ul> <p>The Council considers that developers should make provision for faith groups and for burials as these are vital requirements for all settlements and must be included in the initial planning of a development. The requirement has been included in adopted AAPs that have been found sound through the examination process.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council are concerned that insufficient reference has been made to the role of faith facilities in providing for the needs of the wider community. The Council has recognised the importance of making provision for faith groups by including it in the list in section 4 of the policy. More details on the specific needs of such groups could be considered within the community development strategy that must be prepared for the larger scale major developments.</p> <p>The County Council has highlighted that there is a particular need for a new Household Recycling Centre within the district. In Policy SC/4 the need for a development to provide for waste and recycling facilities is listed in section 4. An allocation for such a use could not be incorporated into the policy as this is a County matter for consideration in a review of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan. The County Council is reviewing its position on HRC provision across the County which may clarify its position.</p> <p>The Council has considered the vital role of community</p>
--	--

	<p>development by including section 8 within the policy. The County Council is concerned about the future funding of social infrastructure in new communities and wants reference to the JSNA New Communities Report (2010) with its key theme of the need to promote social infrastructure in new communities within the plan. The plan has taken into account the findings of this JSNA in the evidence base and therefore does not need to refer it further.</p> <p>A number of parish councils have highlighted the omission in the policy of the consideration of future governance of the proposed new settlements. Whilst this is not a planning matter the Council recognises that governance arrangements are an important issue when major new developments come forward. This will involve working with local parish councils to explore their preferences and could include the creation of a new parish council or extending the role of a neighbouring / existing council if appropriate. This can help in creating a sense of place in a new community and achieving early cohesion and implementation of policies. A minor change is proposed to the supporting text to highlight this issue.</p> <p>The Council does not consider it appropriate to include within the plan a new policy on healthcare as the need for such facilities is taken into account within other policies in the plan notably Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs. It is for the relevant health body to consider the existing and future needs for health provision throughout the district. The Council recognises that within the lifetime of the plan the provision of healthcare is likely to change with the need for smaller scale clinics as doctors carry out more local procedures. This will have consequences within the rural communities in South Cambs which can be positively addressed through the policy framework included within the plan and in the planning of future communities.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Add '<u><b>j. cultural buildings</b></u>' to the list in section 4 of Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs.</p> <p>Add new paragraph after 9.13 which states:  <u><b>'As part of the development of a new community the Council recognises the importance of working with local parish councils to consider at an early stage the form of governance that would be most appropriate for major developments such as new settlements. Similar consideration may also apply where developments are physically an extension to one village but lie within an adjoining parish.'</b></u></p>

**Consideration of Sub-regional facilities including Community Stadium and Sawston Stadium.**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 84</b></p> <p><b>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1) Questions 4 to 7</b></p>	<p><b>Community Stadium</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridgeshire Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2005)</li> <li>• Cambridge Community Stadium – Feasibility Study (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2007)</li> <li>• Cambridge Sub-Regional Facilities Review (Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Councils 2012)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>None</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>The term ‘community stadium’ is used to describe a sports stadium facility that delivers amenities and services to local communities beyond its core operations. These may include health, leisure and general community provisions and/or sports and education facilities, as well as local retail and other local businesses. A community stadium also aims to be accessible to the local community at all times during the day and evening, on weekdays and weekends.</p> <p>The Councils individually sought views on whether a community stadium was needed in the Cambridge Sub Region in their 2012 issues and options consultations. Subsequently the Councils reviewed the evidence available, to explore whether there is a need for a community stadium and what a community stadium would encompass.</p> <p>The Cambridge Sub-Regional Facilities Review looked at previous studies that have identified the potential benefit to the Cambridge Sub-Region of a community stadium, meeting the needs of one or more of its major sports clubs and providing supporting facilities to local communities. A community stadium could raise the sporting profile of the area, whilst delivering a community hub through, for example, the provision of sports participation and other community accessible activities and/or local business engagement opportunities.</p> <p>Previous studies also suggest that Cambridge United FC would likely be the anchor tenant for a stadium of the scale envisaged (circa 10,000 seats). The existing Abbey Stadium site on</p>

	<p>Newmarket Road meets the current needs of Cambridge United, although the current facilities are not ideal for the club. The facilities at this site do not currently contribute to the broader range of activities that would be found in a community stadium facility.</p> <p>Given this situation, no specific need has been identified in the Cambridge Sub- Regional Facilities Review requiring the provision of a community stadium, and it concludes that whether there is considered to be a need for a community stadium to serve the Cambridge Sub-Region is a subjective issue. However, the Review identifies that the right package of uses in a suitable location could deliver benefits for the wider sub-region. It was determined that there should be further public consultation on this issue.</p> <p>Drawing on factors identified in the Review, the Councils identified principles for a community stadium that could be applied, and these were included in the Issues and Options 2013 consultation.</p> <p>To deliver a standalone stadium would require around 3 hectares but, for a community stadium with additional community and sporting facilities, a much larger site would be needed. Site options have been explored within Cambridge, on the edge of Cambridge and elsewhere. There are few sites of this scale available within the built up area of Cambridge. Outside Cambridge much of the land is in the Green Belt, which would preclude this type of development unless the need and benefit was such that it provided an exceptional circumstance to justify a review of the Green Belt through the Local Plan review.</p> <p>Following the first Issues and Options consultation, the Councils explored the potential of a range of site options to provide a community stadium as part of the Cambridge Sub-Regional Facilities Review, including a number of sites that were suggested in responses to the consultation. There are major issues associated with all site options and this may mean that some sites may not be capable of being delivered. However, was considered appropriate to consult on these options at this stage in the process before any decisions are taken on whether a community stadium should be provided and if so where. The view of the local community is an important step in the process. It is also recognised that for some site options, landowners may have different aspirations and we would encourage these to be made clear through the consultation before any decisions are taken. The consultation document highlights the advantages and disadvantages of each option to inform comment.</p>
--	---

	<p>It was highlighted that the Councils had not yet made a decision regarding the need for a site, and were not promoting a specific option, but sought views on potential options in order to inform decision making. Three potential sites were identified, within or on the edge of the city, which are outside the Green Belt, three on the edge of the City in the Green Belt, and three in planned or potential new settlements.</p>
<p><b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b></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><b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b></p>	<p>See below.</p>
<p><b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b></p>	<p>This appraisal considers the inclusion of a stadium proposal in the Local Plan. A community stadium would require land, and therefore has a potentially negative impact on minimising loss of undeveloped land, but this, like impact on many objectives, would depend on the location identified. The benefits of a community stadium would depend on the facilities included, but there are potential positive contributions to the human health and open space objectives. It could also benefit the economy. Impact on transport objectives is uncertain, as it would depend on the location selected.</p>
<p><b>Representations Received</b></p>	<p><b>Issues and Options 2012</b></p> <p><b>Question 84:</b></p> <p><b>A.</b> Is there a need for a community stadium? (<b>S: 116, O: 13, C: 12</b>)</p> <p><b>B.</b> If there is a need, what type and size of facility should it be, and where is the most appropriate location? (<b>S: 75, O: 19, C: 19</b>)</p>

	<p><b>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1)</b></p> <p>Paras 10.1 to 10.6 (Introduction – community stadium issues) (S:106, O:9, C:15)</p> <p>Paras 10.7 &amp; 10.8 (Principles for a Community Stadium) (S:58 O:5 C:2)</p> <p><b>Question 4:</b> Do you think there is a need for a community stadium serving the sub-region? (<b>S: 384, O: 70, C: 131</b>)</p> <p><b>Question 5:</b> Do you agree with the principles identified for the vision for a community stadium? (<b>S: 331, O: 33, C: 25</b>)</p> <p><b>Question 6:</b> If a suitable site cannot be found elsewhere, do you think the need is sufficient to provide exceptional circumstances for a review of the Green Belt to accommodate a community stadium? (<b>S: 303, O: 62, C: 23</b>)</p> <p>Paras 10.9 to 10.13 (Potential Community Stadium Site Options) (S:24 O:23 C:12)</p> <p><b>Question 7:</b> Which if any of the following site options for a community stadium do you support or object to, and why? (<b>S: 238, O: 27, C: 54</b>)</p> <p><b>Site Option CS1:</b> The Abbey Stadium and Adjoining Allotment Land, Newmarket Road, Cambridge Support: 25 Object: 52 Comment: 16 (additional from Question 7: S:13, O:2 C: 8)</p> <p><b>Site Option CS2:</b> Cowley Road Cambridge (former Park and Ride and Golf Driving Range) Support: 25 Object: 32 Comment: 17 (additional from Question 7: S:8, O:0 C: 6)</p> <p><b>Site Option CS3:</b> North of Newmarket Road, Cambridge East Support: 17 Object: 23 Comment: 15 (additional from Question 7: S:10, O:1 C: 6)</p> <p><b>Site Option CS4:</b> Land south of the A14 and west of Cambridge Road (NIAB3)</p>
--	--

	<p>Support: 8 Object: 190 Comment: 14 (additional from Question 7: S:2 O:7 C: 2)</p> <p><b>Site Option CS5:</b> Land south of Trumpington Meadows, Hauxton Road, Cambridge Support: 87 Object: 93 representations and a petition of 900 signatures submitted to City Council in 2012 Comment: 20</p> <p>(Total Individual representors from Q7 and CS5: Support: 291 Object: 106 Comment: 26)</p> <p><b>Site Option CS6:</b> Land between Milton and Impington, north of A14 (Union Place) Support: 11 Object: 46 Comment: 10 (Additional from Question 7: S:0 O:9 C: 1)</p> <p><b>Site Option CS7:</b> Northstowe Support: 11 Object: 37 Comment: 16 (additional from Question 7: S:1 O:6 C:6)</p> <p><b>Site Option CS8:</b> Waterbeach Town New Option Support: 13 Object: 34 Comment: 13 (additional from Question 7: S:3 O:5 C: 5)</p> <p><b>Site Option CS9:</b> Bourn Airfield New Village Support: 7 Object: 43 Comment: 10 (additional from Question 7: S:1, O:4 C: 4)</p>
<p><b>Key Issues from Representations</b></p>	<p><b>Issues and Options 2012</b></p> <p><b>Question 84:</b> Is there a need for a community stadium?</p> <p><b>Main Views Received:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area needs a first class stadium and sporting facilities that everyone can benefit from.</li> <li>• PMP 2006 report for Cambridge Horizons identified a gap in sports provision within Cambridge Sub-Region.</li> <li>• Shortage of readily accessible high quality sporting facilities – bulk of sports provision in the area is largely limited to University students and those at private schools.</li> <li>• Would provide employment.</li> <li>• Not fair on the majority who have no interest in football.</li> <li>• New community stadium should include adequate facilities for active participation in sports and physical recreation by public and not simply be a venue for spectator sports.</li> </ul>

If there is a need, what type and size of facility should it be, and where is the most appropriate location?

**Main Views Received:**

- Within cycling distance of City Centre.
- Support for Trumpington Meadows (75 representations) – good transport links, would not clog local streets, ability to support growing local community.
- Objection to Trumpington Meadows (20 representations) – Green Belt, Traffic congestion, park and ridge full on match days, fan base not local, unsustainable location, light and noise pollution.
- Northstowe / Waterbeach Barracks / Union Place.
- Not in A14 corridor.
- Athletics / hockey / football facilities.
- Sites amongst the population it is intended to serve.
- Should have a range of other facilities e.g. conference, restaurant, entertainment, facilities to support complimentary community projects.

**Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1)**

**Question 4:**

Do you think there is a need for a community stadium serving the sub-region?

**Main Views Received:**

- Widespread support for concept with a range of community sport facilities: Yes (65% of responses); No (19% of responses).
- 7% of responses specifically state not in Green Belt.
- Should be investment spread across a number of local sports facilities / community centres rather than one multi-purpose stadium.
- Would help to promote active lifestyles and a sense of community.
- There is a shortage of all-weather pitches for the community and Cambridge needs a bigger indoor sports hall.
- Desirable, but cannot be considered as a need.
- Concerns about traffic impact if located at Trumpington Meadows.
- Undecided / not enough evidence there is or will be sufficient demand to make a facility viable.
- Public money or S106 funds should not be used for Cambridge United.

	<p><b>Question 5:</b> Do you agree with the principles identified for the vision for a community stadium?</p> <p><b>Main Views Received:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widespread support for the principles: Yes (78% of responses); No outright (5% of responses); Partial agreement or other comment (17%).</li> <li>• No necessity for a stadium to be combined with sports facilities for local residents.</li> <li>• Full support for the principle that the stadium must be available for community use.</li> <li>• The term ‘community stadium’ misrepresents what is being proposed as it would be a sub-regional venue rather than a facility for the community.</li> <li>• The principles could make specific reference to other sporting needs, such as a lead climbing wall.</li> <li>• Any site should be capable of expansion of both buildings and practice / playing areas in the longer term.</li> <li>• Additional principles suggested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Must have good strategic road access;</li> <li>○ Must have sustainable transport links;</li> <li>○ Must not have any substantial adverse effect on local community where it is based;</li> <li>○ Must avoid adverse environmental impact;</li> <li>○ Must maximise its return on investment for long term viability;</li> <li>○ Must not be in the Green Belt;</li> <li>○ Must be sited away from housing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Question 6:</b> If a suitable site cannot be found elsewhere, do you think the need is sufficient to provide exceptional circumstances for a review of the Green Belt to accommodate a community stadium?</p> <p><b>Main Views Received:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for Stadium and associated sports facilities outweigh Green Belt;</li> <li>• Sites outside the Green Belt have considerable disadvantages compared to the Green Belt options;</li> <li>• No exceptional circumstances, No specific need has been identified;</li> <li>• Other options existing outside the Green Belt;</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Option CS1:</b> The Abbey Stadium and Adjoining Allotment Land, Newmarket Road, Cambridge</p>
--	---

	<p>Key issues in representations:</p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing site;</li> <li>• Outside green belt;</li> <li>• Central to Cambridge, accessible by public transport;</li> <li>• Can relocate allotments;</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic impact,</li> <li>• Loss of allotments, an important local amenity;</li> <li>• Not big enough to accommodate stadium;</li> <li>• Better to use the site for housing;</li> <li>• Environmental impacts on residential area</li> <li>• Unclear how it would be funded.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would need a suitable location for replacement allotments;</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Option CS2:</b> Cowley Road Cambridge (former Park and Ride and Golf Driving Range)</p> <p>Key issues in representations:</p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Near new Station and guided bus;</li> <li>• Brownfield land outside the Green Belt;</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too Small;</li> <li>• Poor road access, away from residential areas;</li> <li>• Site will become high value, important for delivery of new mixed use employment area;</li> <li>• City Council – Employment Development only</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Option CS3:</b> North of Newmarket Road, Cambridge East</p> <p>Key issues in representations:</p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to existing site &amp; Park and Ride;</li> <li>• Already removed from Green Belt;</li> <li>• Good Access to A14;</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marshalls - not available;</li> <li>• Housing more important;</li> <li>• Floodlighting not compatible with airport uses.</li> <li>• Not clear how it would be funded;</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p><b>Site Option CS4:</b> Land south of the A14 and west of Cambridge Road (NIAB3)</p> <p>Key issues in representations:</p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to A14</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be no further development on this land;</li> <li>• Green Belt impact,</li> <li>• Too small,</li> <li>• Traffic congestion on A14</li> <li>• Within Air quality management area;</li> <li>• Land owner – not available</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Option CS5:</b> Land south of Trumpington Meadows, Hauxton Road, Cambridge</p> <p>Key issues in representations:</p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good transport and road access,</li> <li>• Would bring sporting and community benefits,</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt justified;</li> <li>• Available (specific proposal submitted)</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic Congestion and Parking;</li> <li>• Inadequate infrastructure and public transport;</li> <li>• Green Belt impact, Visual impact and harm to the edge of the City;</li> <li>• Biodiversity impact;</li> <li>• Conditional on development of 400 additional homes;</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Option CS6:</b> Land between Milton and Impington, north of A14 (Union Place)</p> <p>Key issues in representations:</p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to CRC</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor access, too far and isolated from the City</li> <li>• Green Belt harm, coalescence with surrounding communities;</li> <li>• No justification for facilities;</li> <li>• Impact on Gypsy and Traveller site;</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p><b>Site Option CS7: Northstowe</b></p> <p>Key issues in representations:</p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Green Belt,</li> <li>• Near Guided Bus</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too far from City,</li> <li>• Impact on other uses</li> <li>• Endorsed DFD NAAP contains no provision for stadium/ conflict with other planning proposals/ better used for housing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Option CS8: Waterbeach Town New Option</b></p> <p>Key issues in representations:</p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Green Belt,</li> <li>• Near Railway,</li> <li>• Support from landowners if need is established</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too far from City;</li> <li>• Would not provide community hub for Cambridge;</li> <li>• Long lead in time.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Option CS9: Bourn Airfield New Village</b></p> <p>Key issues in representations:</p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Green Belt</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too far from City</li> <li>• Lack of public transport</li> <li>• Land owner – not available</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council do not consider that objective, up to date evidence of need for a community stadium has been demonstrated.</p> <p>A review of evidence (Major Facilities Sub Regional Facilities in the Cambridge Area - Review of Evidence and Site Options, included in Annex B) concluded that demonstrable need is a subjective issue, and should be tested further through public consultation, particularly as public consultation did not form part of previous studies.</p> <p>There are potential benefits to a community stadium scheme,</p>

	<p>highlighted by the studies, but the Councils have to make a judgement whether the need has been demonstrated, and in particular whether need is sufficient to provide exceptional circumstances for a review of the Green Belt. It is not considered that the need is sufficient to justify a Green Belt review, particularly given the harmful impacts identified of the sites tested.</p> <p>Through the plan making process the Councils sought to identify potential site options that could accommodate a community stadium. A range of options were considered before 9 options were identified. Two sites were suggested to the Council were included in the public consultation. All presented significant challenges, and were published for consultation highlighting these difficulties.</p> <p>Only three potential sites of the scale required were identified in Cambridge. The potential for the existing Abbey Stadium site to be enlarged to accommodate a Community Stadium was explored, which would require development of a significant area of established allotments. Although these could potentially be replaced elsewhere, this would likely be on the edge of the City, a significant distance from the current site. Allotments are in high demand, and this site is particularly accessible to a large residential area. The current Cambridge Local Plan protects allotments. The need for a stadium does not appear to be sufficient to warrant their loss.</p> <p>The former park and ride site at Cowley Road could potentially be big enough to provide a standalone stadium, although it would have limited accessibility to residential areas. The importance of this area as a mixed use employment led development, utilising opportunities provided by the new railway station and links to the guided busway has been highlighted elsewhere in the plan. The landowner has highlighted their intention to support this vision. The site is therefore not considered available for this use.</p> <p>The land north of Newmarket Road, removed from the Green Belt through the last round of plan making as part of Cambridge East was also explored. The land owner has indicated that they do not consider the land available or suitable for this use. They intend to bring forward the site for residential development.</p> <p>The City of Cambridge is surrounded by Green Belt, the purpose of which includes to protect the setting of the historic city. Green Belt would preclude this type of development unless the need was sufficient to provide exceptional circumstances to justify a review.</p>
--	--

	<p>Two sites were submitted through representations proposing sites in the Green Belt. In both of these cases the Green Belt Study (2012) demonstrates the significant harm to the purposes of the Green Belt that would result from further development in these locations. Although support was demonstrated through representations to the issues and options report, there was also a considerable level of objection to specific proposals, and through the wider issues and options consultation, to further development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>North of the A14, Leonard Martin proposed a site between Histon and Milton (referred to as Union Place) large enough to accommodate a range of facilities. The representations proposed a community stadium with 10,000 seat capacity, a concert hall, and ice rink, and a large and high quality conference centre and an adjoining extended hotel. This scale of development, breaching the line of the A14, would cause significant harm to the purposes of the Green Belt, particularly resulting in greater risk of coalescence with the nearby villages. It has not been demonstrated that the package of proposals would function and be delivered, or how the significant transport and accessibility constraints of the site could be overcome.</p> <p>A site south of Trumpington Meadows was proposed by Grosvenor, who own the Abbey Stadium site. They consider they have the only deliverable and viable proposal, and represents a good fit to the opportunities identified in the PMP study that a community stadium could provide. It includes additional indoor and outdoor sports facilities. The proposal includes 400 homes, which the developer considers necessary to enable delivery.</p> <p>When the adjoining Trumpington Meadows site was removed from the Green Belt, the scale of the site was determined to be the most that could be developed without causing major harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt and required the creation of a new high quality urban edge and distinctive gateway development. Extending the urban edge further south would cause the City to extend as far as the M11 motorway and thus negatively impact on the compact nature of the City and its setting. Development on this site would link physically and visually with that at Trumpington Meadows and Glebe Farm. It would extend the urban edge down a visually exposed southwest facing slope to meet the M11 corridor. It would extend the City southwest in the form of an isolated promontory. The land adjoining the Trumpington Meadows development has been designed to achieve a soft green complementing a new and distinctive urban edge. Development of a stadium would form a new edge against the M11 blocking views to townscape and</p>
--	---

	<p>landscape. The development would have a severe adverse impact on the setting of the City, and on the purposes of Green Belt in terms of openness and setting of the City.</p> <p>Additional information would be required to demonstrate transport impacts can be addressed. This includes interaction with the Park and Ride site. Liaison with police on traffic and crowd management, and public safety issues will be required. The Police Architectural Liaison Officer advises that issues have not been addressed to their satisfaction, and they therefore maintain an objection at this stage. The stadium proposal is accompanied by a proposal for 400 dwellings, to make the site viable. Evidence has not been submitted to justify why this level of accompanying development is needed.</p> <p>A third site in the Green Belt was tested, north of the site removed from the Green Belt for development through the last plan review between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Cambridge. This also presented development challenges that would be difficult to overcome, but in addition the landowner has clarified through the consultation that the site is not available for this use.</p> <p>Away from Cambridge new settlement options were explored. Northstowe has progressed too far to include proposals, and the land area in the town is needed to achieve the level of planned development. The owners of Bourn airfield have clarified their site would not be available for this use. The promoters of the Waterbeach New Town stated that if there was a demonstrable need, provision could be explored, but this would be a longer term option, as most of the town is anticipated to come forward after 2031.</p> <p>Other promoters of new or expanded new settlements have stated that their sites could be available for this use. These sites have not been identified in the draft plan, and the potential to include a stadium does not justify a change to this approach.</p>
<p><b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b></p>	<p>No policy.</p>

<p><b>Additional Single Issue Consultation 2013</b></p>	<p><b>Sawston Stadium Proposal</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>None</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>A site north of the Dales Manor Business Park Sawston was put forward to the Council by the promoters Cambridge City FC</p>

	<p>relatively late in the Local Plan process. Due to local interest in the issue, the Council decided to carry out a focussed consultation on this single issue. An additional single issue consultation was held between 25 March and 6 May 2013.</p> <p>The consultation documents can be viewed here:  <a href="http://scamb.jdi-consult.net/ldf/readdoc.php?docid=223">http://scamb.jdi-consult.net/ldf/readdoc.php?docid=223</a></p> <p>It should be highlighted that this is not a site option for the Community Stadium for the Cambridge Sub-Region.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	<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>
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	Should the Local Plan allocate the site north of Dales Manor Business Park, Babraham Road Sawston, for a football stadium with associated public open space?
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	The Sustainability appraisal of the site highlighted the benefits in terms of additional open space, but also potential negative impacts on landscape, biodiversity, and transport.
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 80 Object: 150 Comment: 41
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a recreation hub for this large village, where there is an existing shortage;</li> <li>• To stay in existence many clubs have had to relocate; Club have explored alternative locations;</li> <li>• Transform a derelict site;</li> <li>• Visitors generally outside peak traffic times;</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflict with Green Belt policies, no case made for Green Belt review;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wider landscape impacts, and impact on village character;</li> <li>• Too far from Cambridge;</li> <li>• Traffic impact, on Babraham Road and wider area;</li> <li>• Poor access to public transport;</li> <li>• Although typical crowds small, concern if there is a big game or club gain promotion;</li> <li>• Impacts of floodlighting and noise on a residential area;</li> <li>• Compatibility with residential development, including if land to south is allocated for residential;</li> <li>• Biodiversity impact – woodland site, home to variety of species;</li> <li>• Babraham, Stapleford, Haslingfield Parish Councils – object.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough detail for informed comments to be made;</li> <li>• <b>Sawston Parish Council</b> - concerned that matches would generate a large volume of traffic and cause significant congestion around the access to the site on Babraham Road, at the junction of Babraham Road and Cambridge Road, at the junctions of the A1301 with Cambridge Road and the A505 and at the junction between Babraham High St and the A1307. Need to assess noise and light issues, and impact on biodiversity; Plan does not take into account development of Dales Manor for residential, the only site in Sawston that enjoys clear public support; concerned that removal of this land from the green belt could potentially enable development in general;</li> <li>• <b>Police Architectural Liaison Officer</b> – Few city matches require a police presence, but still need to resolve a range of issues.</li> <li>• <b>Wildlife Trust, Natural England</b> – Need for more detailed biodiversity surveys.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>Do not include an allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council needs to determine whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify a Green Belt review to accommodate the stadium proposal. In a similar vein to the community stadium, need can be considered subjective. Sawston would benefit from additional recreation facilities, but it must be considered whether this is justification for a substantial development in the Green Belt. The consultation did not indicate significant support for the proposal. The club have provided details of the alternative options they have explored, and consider no other site that meets their needs is available, although Cambridge City Football Club have now reached agreement for temporary sharing of Histon Football clubs ground.</p> <p>A number of environmental concerns were raised by respondents.</p>

	<p>The club have submitted surveys of biodiversity and additional information on traffic.</p> <p>In terms of biodiversity, the Council's Ecology Officer has reviewed the evidence submitted by the promoters. The officer is concerned about the completeness of this evidence, as it is based on only one visit, and does not consider impacts on the whole site. Given the potential importance of a woodland area to bats this is not sufficient. Ponds have also not been surveyed. The area needed for the stadium and the proposals are still evolving and it has not yet been demonstrated that the site and surrounding area are suitable for the development.</p> <p>Additional evidence submitted on contamination indicates that the site is likely to be capable of appropriate remediation. Clean up of the site would be a beneficial.</p> <p>The County Council is still in discussion with the football club on car parking and traffic.</p> <p>Compatibility with proposed residential development of Dales Manor Business Park is a particular issue. Whilst the proposal includes car parking, there could be overspill for significant matches. If the site remained employment, it could accommodate on street parking, but it would be less compatible with streets designed for residential use. There are particular concerns if a larger than average crowd were to attend or the club was to achieve its long term aim of league promotion.</p> <p>Whilst the site already benefits from significant natural screening, landscape impact of a floodlit stadium would be significant. Indicative masterplans indicate that a number of trees would have to be removed. It is likely impact on the Green Belt would be significant.</p> <p>There is not currently sufficient certainty that environmental impacts of the site can be satisfactorily addressed. In addition it is not considered that the need is sufficient to warrant its removal from the Green Belt, and development that would harm the purposes of the Green Belt and access through adjoining local residential roads would not be desirable.</p> <p>Annex 2 of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal of this site (see the 'Recreation and Open Space' section).</p>
<p><b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b></p>	<p>No policy.</p>

**Paragraph 9.16- 9.18 Consideration of Sub-regional facilities including Community Stadium and Sawston Stadium.**

<p><b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b></p>	<p>Total: 15                  Support : 8 (including 5 Parish Councils specifically supporting non- inclusion of Community Stadium)                  Object: 7 (including 1 Parish Council objecting to non- inclusion of policy for sub-regional facilities)</p>
<p><b>Main Issues</b></p>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Grantchester Parish Council</b> - support decision not to further consider Community Stadium at Trumpington Meadows. Need for stadium on green belt not been demonstrated and 900 signature petition against demonstrated local opposition. Community Stadium should be sited amongst population it is intended to serve so supporters can walk to games. Green Belt not appropriate location for stadium.</li> <li>• <b>Harlton and Haslingfield Parish Councils</b> – support rejection of stadium at Trumpington</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick Parish Council</b> – support rejection of stadium proposals</li> <li>• <b>Great Shelford Parish Council</b> – no compelling case for allocating community stadium or other facilities in green belt</li> <li>• General support for no inclusion of community stadium at Trumpington – would conflict with new country park; would undermine viability of Trumpington facilities; site poorly served by public transport.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> – support for emphasis that provision of sub regional facilities in Green Belt would only be allowed if exceptional circumstances.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Trumpington Residents Association</b> – Support Councils’ assessment that green belt location for community stadium not appropriate. Fundamentally opposed to such a stadium. Policy does not include way the Council would respond to proposals for sub-regional community, sports and leisure facilities – should include specific reference to Council’s policy consistent with City Council Policy 73.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick Parish Council</b> – object to plan not including site for ice rink. A suitable site would be the rowing lake at Waterbeach. Object that plan does not include a concert hall – suitable site at Northstowe or off A428 near Cambridge</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge FA</b> – growing demand for football and to deliver FA strategy need improved facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Community Stadium</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Grosvenor/ Wrenbridge Ltd</b> - Plan fails to respond to evidence base and sporting needs of Cambridge and surrounding area. Land west of Hauxton Rd, Trumpington and at Abbey Stadium, Newmarket Rd should be allocated for community football stadium, indoor and outdoor sports and residential development to fund delivery. Release 15 hectares from green belt west of Hauxton Rd. to accommodate residential development and built sports facilities. Land between new green belt boundary and M11 provide outdoor sport and ancillary features. Proposed wording for policy and supporting text.</li> <li>• New policy for Community stadium – should be new policy as stadium is absolute priority for area. Surely one of nine sites proposed was sufficient. With planned growth and resulting increased population need for adequate sporting facilities to meet community needs. Both Cambridge United and City need stadium. Benefits clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sawston Stadium</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for new policy to allow for football stadium in Sawston – village would benefit from additional sporting facilities and green space proposed by club. Potential traffic issues overstated. Proposed site is brownfield site not greenfield.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>There was support for the non-inclusion of a policy allocation for a community stadium from parish councils. The promoters for a Community Stadium on a site south west of Trumpington Meadows have requested that an allocation be made in the plan and have included both sites at Trumpington Meadows and the Abbey Stadium within the city which would leave open where different facilities would be proposed. Whichever site is proposed for a community stadium the Councils remain unconvinced that there is a compelling case of need to change their plans.</p> <p>The Councils explored issues regarding sub regional facilities, and in particular a Community Stadium, through the issues and options process, including consideration of potential site options.</p> <p>There are potential benefits to a community stadium scheme, highlighted by previous studies, but the Councils have to make a judgement whether the need has been demonstrated such that it would provide exceptional circumstances for a review of the Green Belt boundary. It is not considered that the commercial demand for football amounts to a need that is sufficient to justify a further</p>

	<p>green belt boundary change, particularly given the harmful impacts on Green Belt purposes identified of the sites tested.</p> <p>There was concern that the Council has not included a policy as to how it would consider new sub-regional facilities. The Cambridgeshire Football Association highlighted the need to provide increased sports facilities to meet the growing demand from the existing and future residents. Opportunities may arise for sub-regional facilities to be incorporated into the new growth areas when master planning is carried out. The Council will consider proposals for such facilities on their merits through the planning application process against a range of relevant policies of the plan and therefore a specific policy is not proposed.</p> <p>Only one respondent has requested that the plan include a site for a football stadium at Sawston for Cambridge City and no change is proposed to the plan. No representations were submitted by the promoters who have subsequently submitted a planning application.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>No change</b></p>

## Policy SC/5: Hospice Provision

<b>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2) Issue 8</b>	<b>Hospice Provision</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	
<b>Existing policies</b>	None.
<b>Analysis</b>	A representation was made to the Council's 2012 Issues and Options consultation in relation to hospice provision. Hospices provide palliative care for the terminally and seriously ill. They form an important part of community infrastructure and include the Arthur Rank Hospice on Mill Road, Cambridge and the East Anglia Children's Hospices at Milton. Along with Cambridge City Council, the Council is continuing to investigate site options as part of the preparation of the draft Local Plan.
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	<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>
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 8:</b> Are there any sites which might be suitable for allocation for new hospice provision?</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	Primary goal of policy would be to seek to re-use previously developed land, it would therefore have potential to contribute significantly to the achievement of the land objective, although it is noted in the Scoping Report that previously developed land opportunities in the district are relatively limited. References to sustainable locations indicate a positive impact on the sustainable transport objective, and accessibility to services. Reference to 'not of high environmental value' also indicates biodiversity issue would be taken into account. Whether such principles are in a standalone policy, or a general sustainable development policy is largely a procedural matter.
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 1 Object: 0 Comment: 3

<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Northstowe;</li> <li>• Trustees of the Arthur Rank Hospice - It is important that any new site is within a reasonable travel distance of Addenbrooke's Hospital and is easily accessible by public transport and the private car. To meet operational standards and the optimum environmental conditions for a new 16 bed hospice, a site of some 1.34 Ha is likely to be required. Most appropriate approach to dealing with identification of a new site for Arthur Rank Hospice is through the inclusion of a 'Development Management' policy, rather than identifying a specific site.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>Include a criteria based policy in the Successful Communities chapter.</p> <p>A suitable site has not been identified through the plan making process, therefore a criteria based policy is a suitable way for the plan to address this issue. Many issues that would impact on the design and location of a hospice would be addressed by other policies in the plan, therefore the policy does not need to be extensive.</p> <p>The draft policy supports development within village frameworks. It is noted in the representation by Arthur Rank Hospice that they are seeking a site near to Addenbrooke's Hospital. South of Cambridge land outside development frameworks forms part of the Green Belt. It would not be appropriate for the policy to support development in the Green Belt, but supporting text outlines that proposals in the Green Belt would have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances, including a lack of available sites elsewhere.</p>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/5: Hospice Provision
<b>Policy SC/5: Hospice Provision (and paragraph 9.19)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 2 Support: 0 Object: 2</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Arthur Rank Hospice</b> – Welcome policy but concerned policy fails to understand hospice requirements, locating close to acute hospital, and increasing role in community healthcare.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust</b> – Policy should be upgraded to include wider healthcare</li> </ul>

	<p>facilities. Suggest change of wording in policy and supporting text by replacing 'hospices' with 'community healthcare facilities'.</p>
<p><b>Assessment</b></p>	<p>This new policy was brought forward following a request by the Arthur Rank Hospice Charity for help in finding a site for a new hospice as part of the plan making process. The policy goes as far as is appropriate in the plan, without specific evidence supporting a particular site, which has not been forthcoming through the plan making process. The plan cannot imply where exceptions will be made to Green Belt policy. Any proposals in the Green Belt can be treated on their merits through the application process.</p> <p>The Council does not consider it appropriate to widen the scope of this policy to consider wider healthcare facilities as this use does not specifically fit into this category. The issue of including a specific policy relating to healthcare is considered in discussions in Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>No change</b></p>

## Policy SC/6: Indoor Community Facilities

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 92</b>	<b>Indoor Community Facilities</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Assessment 2010
<b>Existing policies</b>	Development Control Policies DPD: DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments.
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>Indoor community facilities, including village halls, community halls, church halls and other publicly accessible facilities, play a crucial role in maintaining a sense of local identity, as well as provide a base for a variety of different groups and activities, from pre-school groups; to indoor mat bowls; to yoga; for meetings or for coffee mornings.</p> <p>In 2009 South Cambridgeshire District Council commissioned a community facilities assessment. The purpose of the audit was to understand the size and condition of village halls, community halls, church halls and other publicly accessible facilities across the District.</p> <p>It identified standard approach for indoor community space per capita that can be used when considering the needs generated by new development. In developing the standard it considered existing provision levels, good practice examples around the district, standards used elsewhere, and the views of the local community.</p> <p>It identified a standard of 0.11m<sup>2</sup> per capita, or 111m<sup>2</sup> per 1,000 populations. South Cambridgeshire has used this standard to guide negotiations on planning obligations since January 2010. A higher standard may be needed in new communities, where existing facilities do not exist.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> Alternative approach could be to have no standard, and rely on site specific negotiation. The standard proposed has been identified by evidence collated in the local assessment; it is therefore identified as the only option.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Final Issues And Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 92:</b>  <b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan include a policy for indoor community space provision?  <b>B:</b> If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you</p>

	think should be included?
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	Including a standard would seek to ensure appropriate provision of indoor community facilities, contributing to the community involvement objective by providing meeting places which support local activities. . Ensuring facilities are accessible also contributes to sustainable transport objectives.
<b>Representations Received</b>	<b>Question 92A:</b> Support: 47, Object: 1, Comment: 5 <b>Question 92B:</b> Comment: 1
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>Question 92A</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support to retain character of village</li> <li>• 22 Parish Council support</li> <li>• This may include upgrades or essential repair of an existing village hall</li> <li>• Standard seems a little low</li> <li>• Should be proportional to the development</li> <li>• Many developments including Cambourne have insufficient community space provision.</li> <li>• Community indoor space vital commodity and should be protected. Usually in short supply. Should be a policy to protect existing facilities, including nonconformist chapels, to prevent them being converted to private use. School premises should be available for community use when not required by the school.</li> <li>• Policy aimed only at small local facilities (village and community halls). No policy for larger scale indoor community facilities such as sports halls and swimming pools. Needs separate policy.</li> <li>• Survey evidence is valuable. Past behaviour in SCDC has been good and appreciated and should continue</li> <li>• Such facilities are important to building a community</li> <li>• The Local Plan should address the need for indoor space in those settlements where it does not exist as identified in the Community Facilities Audit 2009</li> <li>• An expanded village will need larger indoor facilities.</li> <li>• Need for all weather pitches</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from Over Parish Council</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build youth centres for teenagers to keep them off streets</li> <li>• Higher standard for new communities should be stated in the policy</li> <li>• Could impact viability of small development sites if have to provide funds for such facilities. Cambridge Sports Village could deliver new facilities</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies should be in place for new community facilities, but not then retrospectively applied to existing facilities, without detailed consultations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 92B</b></p> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where existing space exists which would give the whole village standards as proposed no sense in building more. Needs consultation with parish councils and those organisations running village halls. A financial contribution to improve existing facilities might be just as valuable.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>The Local Plan will include a policy including the standard for indoor community space provision and a higher standard for new communities.</p> <p>Respondents have highlighted the importance of community indoor space - it is a vital commodity and should be protected and is usually in short supply. They also say the Local Plan should address the need for indoor space in those settlements where it does not exist as identified in the Community Facilities Audit 2009 and that dual use of school premises should be encouraged and included in a policy.</p> <p>Including a standard ensures that contributions are made, either through S106 or as part of CIL. The standard is based on research in the district carried out in 2009. Significant developments will generate the need for new facilities. In these cases new provision would be required through the developing new communities policy.</p>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/6: Indoor Community Facilities
<b>Policy SC/6: Indoor Community Facilities (and paragraphs 9.20 – 9.22)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 5</p> <p>Support: 2 (including 2 from Parish Council (PC))</p> <p>Object: 3</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Support to ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick PC</b> – Support Policy SC/6.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Home Builders Federation</b> – contrary to national policy paras 203 and 206.(3 tests for planning obligations ) May seek</li> </ul>

	<p>payments through CIL but not planning obligations. Demonstrate tests met and not already charging.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirements onerous and unjustified having regard to evidence base. Unclear how CIL would affect requirement since contributions would be superseded by CIL charge. Costs in relation to viability and cumulative impact not properly tested. Suggest rewording of policy to exclude mention of an appropriate standard and also reference to it in paragraph 9.22 – each development should be determined based on local circumstances.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The policy is a new one to reflect need recognised in the district for indoor community facilities. An assessment was commissioned in 2009 and the standard was extracted from the need identified in this report. The Council is keen to seek developer contributions to the provisions of this facility as the Council considers such facilities vital to creating successful local communities.</p> <p>Policy SC/6 clause 3 states that ‘developments will contribute of off-site provision, through planning obligations or through the Community Infrastructure Levy as appropriate’. It is wholly appropriate to have a policy where it is explicit that infrastructure will be funded through one instrument or the other (i.e. CIL or planning obligations) in the event that one is no longer available to the Council.</p> <p>The Council’s Infrastructure List under CIL Regulation 123 will define what CIL receipts will be spent on and therefore how planning obligations will be limited following the implementation of CIL. The list is currently being worked up and will be subject to consultation and form part of the CIL examination.</p> <p>Any request for a financial contribution under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act will automatically be subject to the 3 tests in accordance with CIL Regulation 123.</p>
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<b>No change</b>

## Policy SC/7: Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments

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

<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 74; Object: 0; Comment: 2
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports new areas being created. Existing must be protected.</li> <li>• Where open space is limited local community may have greater need for accessible playgrounds and local recreation grounds</li> <li>• Need to consult with Parish Councils</li> <li>• 20 Parish Councils support policy</li> <li>• Encourage yes. Enforce no.</li> <li>• Orchards and woodland add to landscape, biodiversity and beauty of area. Improve quality of life of community. If left out of Local Plan will imply that they are not valued</li> <li>• Should include traditional old commercial orchards</li> <li>• Need to ensure that wooded areas are managed and looked after – not just left to be nuisance to neighbours. Could set up partnerships between residents in community to maintain trees.</li> <li>• Need to increase woodland cover – many benefits of trees according to Woodland Trust.</li> <li>• Allotments should be catered for based upon needs assessment</li> <li>• Allotments need water supply and to be close to residential areas</li> <li>• Where existing facilities priority should be to secure financially their future rather than create new separate facilities with increased cost to community</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not be funded by District or County Councils. Parishes can increase precepts and they best appreciate local wishes. So does this need to form part of Local Plan?</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>Include in the Local Plan policies which seek to encourage the creation of community orchards, new woodland areas or allotments in or near to villages and to protect existing ones.</p> <p>There was wide support and no objections to including a policy in the Local Plan. The creation of new and the protection of existing allotments and orchards to be included in same chapter therefore this policy to be included in the ‘Promoting Successful Communities’ chapter.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan recognises value of protecting green areas within district and many orchards, woodland areas and allotments will be specifically protected by other policies – PVAA and LGS.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of new allotments /community orchards and informal recreation areas which could create new woodland is included in open space policies that new development must provide, including standards as to how many according to scale of scheme.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	<p>Policy SC/7: Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments</p> <p>Policy SC/9: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas, Allotments and Community Orchards</p>

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

<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	A key benefit of requiring allotments is to support healthy communities by enabling people to grow their own food. The issue was highlighted in the Scoping Report.
<b>Representations Received</b>	<b>Question 88A:</b> Support: 55, Object: 2, Comment: 4 <b>Question 88B:</b> Support: 31, Object: 6, Comment: 3 <b>Question 88C:</b> Support: 0, Object: 0, Comment: 5
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>Question 88A</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be considered in consultation with Parish Council</li> <li>• 24 Parishes support policy</li> <li>• Provision should be agreed as part of initial planning applications</li> <li>• SCDC and Cambridge City Council have successfully negotiated allotment provision within urban extensions</li> <li>• Many people would prefer larger garden to a large allotment plot</li> <li>• As average size of garden decreases so increased demand for allotments. Smaller allotments may be preferred</li> <li>• Allotments encourage a sense of community</li> <li>• Provision of allotments should be made for good of village as well as the new development.</li> <li>• Legal obligation to provide</li> <li>• Existing facilities should be made financially secure before creating new allotments. Managing and maintenance expensive so need to consider this in S106 agreements or CIL.</li> <li>• Should be provision for vacant allotment land to be maintained until occupied.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No definition for allotment - cannot assess standard of provision</li> <li>• Standard insufficient. Allotments need water supply</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 88B</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 18 Parish Councils support standard</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council supports as same as one they use</li> <li>• Should have higher proportion of open space as informal recreation</li> <li>• By dividing plots into smaller, more manageable sizes, they will be more popular and better maintained.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comberton Parish Council - level of provision seems too low based on local use of allotments in village</li> <li>• Better use can be made of the land for open space everyone can use the space.</li> <li>• The allocation should increase to a minimum of 50 allotments per 1000. Likely to be increased demand in future</li> <li>• Ask Parish Councils before applying an inflexible rule.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement to provide open space should not be commuted because this cash has sometimes been used to maintain existing open space.</li> <li>• Provision should be for nearer 10% rather than just over 3%</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 88C</b></p> <p><b>COMMENTS /ALTERNATIVE APPROACH?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should prevent allotment areas that are being properly used from being developed for housing.</li> <li>• Demand for allotments in Cottenham</li> <li>• If houses were not jammed together would be more room in gardens to grow vegetables and therefore less need for allotments and better living conditions in housing developments</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>The Local Plan should include allotment and community orchard provision within the relevant open space policies to ensure sites are included in major new housing developments using the standard of around 32 allotments per 1,000 households.</p> <p>Wide support for including allotments within a policy in the Local Plan and using the standard which is one used by Cambridge City Council. Some debate about whether the standard is high enough as there is increased demand for allotments as developments are built at a higher density and average garden sizes are smaller. Many representors wanted existing allotments to be protected and the recognition that there was a shortage of allotments within many communities.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allotments are recognised as an important asset in existing villages and should be included in new developments.</li> <li>• Policy includes flexibility to deliver spaces as community orchards as well as allotments, to reflect local views.</li> <li>• Comberton Parish Council states that standard is too low based on local use of allotments in their village. Demand for allotments in Cottenham. Suggestion that standard should increase to minimum of 50 allotments per 1000 and having smaller plots may be more manageable and popular. The evidence base supports the proposed standard. The scope of</li> </ul>

	<p>the policy has been widened to include the protection of existing allotments so there is not increased pressure to reduce the current stock.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S106 agreements for new developments cannot take into account existing needs for allotments in the wider village only that generated by the proposed development. Policy now protecting existing allotments and encouraging creation of new ones.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/7: Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 89</b>	<b>Standards for On-Site Open space Provision</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Open space and New Developments Supplementary Planning Document.</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study Update 2012</li> </ul>
<b>Existing policies</b>	Development Control Policies DPD: Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open space and New Developments (SF/10)
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>The starting point for delivery of open space should be onsite, where it can meet the needs generated by development in the most directly accessible manner. This may not be practical on all developments, particularly as small developments would not generate sufficient need for standalone facilities of all types. In cases where it is not appropriate to provide onsite, developments will contribute to offsite provision, through planning obligations or potentially the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p> <p>The Local Plan needs to provide appropriate guidance regarding when onsite provision will be sought from different types of facility. Existing policy requires developments of 10 dwellings or above to include children's playspace, because it is large enough to deliver a useful space capable of being maintained.</p> <p>Sports pitches and outdoor sport generally require a larger space, and need a larger scale of development to enable effective delivery. The Open space SPD provides guidance seeking onsite provision from developments of 200 dwellings or more. The threshold for allotments has also been identified as 200 dwellings, sufficient to deliver a site of six typical allotment plots.</p> <p>On individual sites negotiation may take place on the types of space provided on-site, taking account of the needs of the area, existing provision and deficiencies.</p>

	<p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: None</b></p> <p>The Local Plan needs to establish when onsite provision is required. The standards proposed are based on a delivery of useable, functional spaces.</p> <p>Informal open space: all scales of development  Children’s play space: 10 or more dwellings  Sports pitches and outdoor sport: 200 or more dwellings  Allotments: 200 or more dwellings</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 89:</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> Do you agree the thresholds for when on-site open space will be required in new developments?</p> <p><b>B:</b> If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	The option considers when different types of open space should be required to be delivered on site in a new development. Similar impacts are identified to the open space provision option (option 82). Clear positive impact on achievement of open space objective, and consequential benefits to human health. Open spaces offer wider benefits to good place making and townscape. Making spaces accessible can reduce the need to travel and promote access by sustainable modes. Standards address when it is practical to deliver certain types of space on site, therefore considering how places will function, and avoiding deliver of spaces that could not practically perform their intended function.
<b>Representations Received</b>	<p><b>Question 89A:</b> Support: 31, Object: 8, Comment: 7</p> <p><b>Question 89B:</b> Support: 0, Object: 2, Comment: 7</p>
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>Question 89A</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support</li> <li>• Support from 16 parish councils</li> <li>• Open space should be useful – not just land left over for open space.</li> <li>• Level for allotments is set too high</li> <li>• Suggest houses having communal areas / larger gardens - Example in Heidelberg</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from Cambridge City Council who had misunderstood the proposed standards and had assumed that it is only developments over 200 that would have to make provision for on- site open space. The standards are set out for all</li> </ul>

	<p>developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gt and Little Abington PCs does not agree with thresholds</li> <li>• Play space should be provided however small the development. Or make gardens larger for children to play in</li> <li>• Allotments are an eyesore / Space could be better served for other open space for community.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depends on layout of new development and proximity of existing open space.</li> <li>• Agree principle of different sorts of provision but should be on case by case basis</li> <li>• Local people should have say in type of open space to be provided to serve local community</li> <li>• May restrict building of new houses if have this policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 89B</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision for allotments too low. Need for more especially with small gardens and high density developments</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council – on site open space provision should be the norm within new residential development. No justification for figure of 200 dwellings as trigger for open space. Too high a threshold. If large number of small developments come forward with under 200 dwellings and none required to provide open space may result in cumulative impact on surrounding provision.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too rigid. Decision on what open space to provide should be made by local community based on local need not by sliding scale in policy. Developer should give money to Parish Council to allocate according to local needs.</li> <li>• All new development needs open space for healthy environment</li> <li>• Sports pitches should have higher threshold -300 dwellings?</li> <li>• Allotments should have threshold of 100 dwellings – 5 allotment plots per 100 dwelling</li> <li>• Local Council must consider written request by 6+ electors to operate Allotment Act – if demand must provide allotments.</li> <li>• Need for consultation with parish councils</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>The Local Plan to include a policy stating the thresholds that will be required in new developments for on-site open space.</p> <p>Support for including a policy but some debate as to what thresholds should be. Some parishes saying that all provision should be based on local need.</p>

	<p>Thresholds ensure meaningful and useable spaces are delivered on site, rather than small sites that would not function for the uses proposed and could be problematic to manage. They are tried and tested locally, as they form part of the current open space SPD. Where provision is not provided on site contributions will be made through s106 or CIL.</p>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/7: Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments
<b>Policy SC/7: Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments ( and paragraphs 9.23 – 9.30 including Figure 11)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 11  Support: 6 (including 5 from Parish Councils (PC))  Object: 5</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn PC</b> – Support ensuring adequate play areas available in new developments to promote safety and well being of children. Many new developments infill and omit space.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Welcome reference to “informal open space suitable for play” in para 9.24 – keen to see variety of spaces.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Support to ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands.</li> <li>• <b>Great Abington PC</b> – Pleased to see recognition of importance of allotments and community orchards. Developments proposed in village include both.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick PC</b> – Support Policy SC/7 and Figure 11.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Welcome reference to creative design approach, but recognise these are places adults want to spend time in too.</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> – Provision of fixed structures associated with outdoor recreation should be appropriately located as not to intrude on sensitive areas e.g. setting of heritage assets.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Would like reference to ANGSt standards as advocated through Green Infrastructure Strategy for provision of multi-functional green infrastructure.</li> <li>• <b>Sport England</b> – Support principle but recommend robust assessment of need using Sport England methodology and action plan be developed which identifies priorities for new open</li> </ul>

	<p>space provision. Do not support principle of providing for new development through a standard of provision. New housing developments should make provision for community indoor sport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support objective, but space standards not always appropriate. Development should take account of provision in immediate area not whole district.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The policy is similar to one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. It has been revised to include the open space required to be provided by housing for the elderly and to include a standard for allotments and community orchards.</p> <p>The County Council has requested that the policy should recognise the needs of adults who may wish to use open space – not just areas for play. The Council considers that informal open space would meet this requirement and this is already referred to in paragraph 9.32.</p> <p>English Heritage is concerned that new open space should not impact on sensitive areas such as the setting of heritage assets Policy NH/14: Heritage Assets already covers this issue.</p> <p>Sport England object to the use of open space standards, but they provide a key mechanism for ensuring new developments deliver new open spaces to meet the needs required. Following their inclusion in the Local Development Framework the standards have proved effective in delivering new open spaces in range of new developments. The Council updated its open space study to support the local plan. This involved a comprehensive survey of existing provision, quality, and identified needs, in consultation with stakeholders. It indicated that the standards remain appropriate, with the addition of a specific standard for allotments.</p> <p>The Local Plan remains sound, but to move the issue forward to support implementation, the Council has now started working with Cambridge City Council, Sport England, and other stakeholders to prepare a Playing Pitch Strategy and action plan for the wider Cambridge area, to help implement the Local Plan proposals and the continued development of sport in the area by stakeholders.</p> <p>A minor change is proposed to highlight the availability of the Recreation and Open Space Study 2013.</p> <p>The Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) mentioned by Natural England helped inform the preparation of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure and the plan includes a policy</p>

	to assist in implementing this strategy – Policy NH/6 As this standard has not been used in the drafting this plan no change is proposed to refer to it.
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Amend paragraph 9.24 as follows:  ‘.... These are primarily owned and operated by parish councils, although the use of management companies is becoming more common within new developments. <b><u>The Council published a Recreation and Open Space Study (2013) which has provided information on the quantity and quality of the open space across the district.</u></b></p>

## Policy SC/8: Open Space Standards

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 87</b>	<b>Open Space Standards</b>						
<b>Key evidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Open space and New Developments Supplementary Planning Document.</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study Update 2012</li> </ul>						
<b>Existing policies</b>	Development Control Policies DPD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open space and new developments (SF/10)</li> <li>• Open space Standards (SF/11)</li> </ul>						
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 73) addresses the importance of access to open space to promote the health and wellbeing of a community and states that local authorities should set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities after they have assessed the quantity and quality of what is available within their area.</p> <p>The District Council has undertaken an audit and assessment of need for open space, updating the previous assessment from 2005 that supported the Local Development Framework. The assessment was undertaken in consultation with Parish Councils, Sports Clubs and governing bodies. It concluded that the existing standards should be maintained.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> The standard proposed has been identified by evidence collated in the local Needs Assessment.</p> <p>The Local Plan should continue to require all new residential development to contribute to the provision of open space in new developments. The standards for provision should remain as the existing plan:</p> <p>Minimum standard of 2.8 hectares per 1,000 people, comprising:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Outdoor Sport</td> <td>1.6 hectares per 1,000 people</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Children’s Play Space</td> <td>0.8 hectares per 1,000 people</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Informal Open Space</td> <td>0.4 hectares per 1,000 people</td> </tr> </table>	Outdoor Sport	1.6 hectares per 1,000 people	Children’s Play Space	0.8 hectares per 1,000 people	Informal Open Space	0.4 hectares per 1,000 people
Outdoor Sport	1.6 hectares per 1,000 people						
Children’s Play Space	0.8 hectares per 1,000 people						
Informal Open Space	0.4 hectares per 1,000 people						
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.						
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<b>Question 87:</b> <b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan continue to include a policy for open space provision?						

	<p><b>B:</b> Do you agree with the standards of provision listed in Issue 87 that is similar to the current adopted policy?</p> <p><b>C:</b> If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	<p>Requiring delivery of open space with appropriate space standards has a clear positive link to achievement of the open space objective.. The Scoping Report, and the recent update to the Recreation Study identified shortages of open space in terms of quantity and quality in many villages. Open space standards would ensure needs are addressed in new developments, and also contribute to good place making. The importance of promoting healthy lifestyles was also identified in the Scoping Report, and providing opportunities to access open space and support sports and other activities will contribute to achievement of the health objective. Making spaces accessible can reduce the need to travel and promote access by sustainable modes.</p>
<b>Representations Received</b>	<p><b>Question 87A:</b> Support: 54, Object: 5, Comment: 3</p> <p><b>Question 87B:</b> Support: 27, Object: 2, Comment: 10</p> <p><b>Question 87C:</b> Support: 0, Object: 0, Comment: 18</p>
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>Question 87A</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vital for development of children and adults.</li> <li>• Support from 23 parish councils</li> <li>• Preference for higher standard than exists in the current development plan.</li> <li>• Need to include minimum space and quality standard for new housing including garden standard.</li> <li>• Need to analyse areas deficient in open space and whether significant number of children – overcrowding of open space</li> <li>• Public space should be allocated where need by public rather than spare land that developer could not use. Land must be quality not just quantity and well maintained.</li> <li>• Small areas within estates (other than LEAPs) should be avoided as they do not provide much scope for informal play, expensive to maintain and can cause friction with neighbours.</li> <li>• Need careful design within development so open space located to minimise disruption to residents.</li> <li>• For smaller developments that do not justify on-site provision, the local authority should develop appropriate criteria for calculating contributions towards off-site provision, including future management and maintenance</li> <li>• Standard used throughout the country and widely accepted. Accepted by developers. If increased would place additional pressures on viability of developments.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No</li> </ul>

	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although open spaces should be multifunctional, certain uses do not mix well. Need clear masterplanning to avoid conflicts.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 87B</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standards too restrictive. Formal recreation use such as a community orchard should not be precluded.</li> <li>• Standard adequate but too many developments offset provision of open space to off-site – practice must stop</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Double provision – existing basic standard too small</li> <li>• Should increase standards – existing not sufficient</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to push developers to provide maximum play space/greenery for children and adults if intend to build sustainable housing</li> <li>• Access to open space significant benefit for community health and wellbeing. Contributes to uniqueness of local area and has economic benefit.</li> <li>• Need large green spaces for team sports.</li> <li>• Get the developers to build safe and well-equipped playgrounds for children.</li> <li>• How do I as layman know what standards mean or how they are applied?</li> <li>• Positioning and design of all open space should take into account the needs of older people.</li> <li>• Facilities should be shared between villages to minimise running costs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 87C</b></p> <p><b>COMMENTS / ALTERNATIVE APPROACH?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision should be made for the provision of burial grounds within new developments including a space standard.</li> <li>• Expand the scope of the Sport category to include "Sport, recreation, leisure and community use"</li> <li>• Open space should be biodiversity rich and appropriate to location.</li> <li>• New developments and smaller villages often lack access to open space and even to countryside. Open space standards could be higher for these communities.</li> <li>• Where already adequate provision of open space close to a new development it may be unnecessary to provide more.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Leave it to Parish Councils to decide whether provision of more space is needed and if not whether contributions to more play equipment would be a better idea.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May impact on viability of development to provide open space – needs discretion if want more housing</li> <li>• Repairs and maintenance are expensive, if each village was responsible for one facility it would spread the load</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>The Local Plan should continue to include a policy for open space provision using the standards set out in Issue 87.</p> <p>The standard is appropriate for the district based on local open space needs assessment. Support for policy including from 23 parish councils. Open space must be carefully designed as part of development. The draft policy includes guidance when provision may be sought on site. On individual sites negotiation may take place on the types of space provided on-site, taking account of the needs of the area, existing provision and any identified deficiencies.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design policies within the Local Plan include consideration of layout of developments and masterplanning will ensure conflicting land uses are not placed where they are not compatible.</li> <li>• The policy includes an element of flexibility to ensure open space provision reflects the needs and opportunities of the site. This includes potential for provision of community orchards.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/8: Open Space Standards
<b>Policy SC/8: Open Space Standards (and paragraph 9.31 – 9.33)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 5  Support: 3 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC))  Object: 2</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn PC</b> – Support ensure adequate open space for communities. Strongly support provision of allotments. Currently large demand and many new developments have small gardens.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Support to ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick PC</b> – Support Policy SC/8</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Home Builders Federation</b> - Unsound, contrary to national</li> </ul>

	<p>policy paras 203 and 206. May seek payments for outdoor space through CIL but not planning obligations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Homes and Communities Agency</b> – Support provision of open space but Northstowe AAP establishes (lower) provision required. Change to provision will affect viability. Clarify.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The policy is similar to one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The standard for open space has been amended to include a standard for allotments and community orchards and further defines the standard for children’s playspace to include both formal and informal play space.</p> <p>Clarity has been sought by the Homes and Community Agency as to the role the existing policies in AAPs as opposed to the community needs policy in the plan. The Northstowe AAP remains part of the statutory development plan for South Cambridgeshire alongside the Local Plan. The Proposed Submission Local Plan clarifies at Appendix B that only Policy NS/3 (1g) is superseded by the Local Plan. Within the AAP Policy NS/9: Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Arts and Culture is specific to the needs of the new town of Northstowe. The Local Plan will include more recently adopted policies and the Council will weigh the appropriate weight to give to individual policies both plans in determining any applications for Northstowe. The open space provision in the Local Plan now includes the need to provide allotments and the agreed Development Framework Document for Northstowe (August 2012) already includes allotments and orchards</p> <p>The Council considers the necessity for new developments to make provision for open space is an acceptable obligation to help to promote the well being of the whole community and for creating better places to live and work.</p> <p>The supporting text for policy SC/7 states that ‘developments will contribute of off-site provision, through planning obligations or through the Community Infrastructure Levy as appropriate’.</p>
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<b>No change</b>

**Policy SC/9: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas, Allotments and Community Orchards**

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see also audit trail for Policy SC/7: Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments.

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 91</b>	<b>Protection of Existing Recreation Areas</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	Audit and Assessment of Open space in South Cambridgeshire 2012
<b>Existing policies</b>	Development Control Policies DPD: SF/9 Protection of Existing recreation areas
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>One of the Council’s corporate aims is to promote active and healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 74) states that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or</li> <li>• the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or</li> <li>• the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.</li> </ul> <p>Existing policy establishes a local approach, including requiring consideration of potential future demand, in consultation with local people and users. The District Council has undertaken an audit and assessment of need for open space which should be referenced in seeking to demonstrate a surplus. These additional issues warrant inclusion in local policy.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b></p> <p>Reflecting the NPPF the Local Plan should appropriately protect existing open spaces, sports and recreation facilities. Alternatives existing around individual criteria.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 91:</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking to protect existing playing fields and recreation facilities?</p>

	<b>B:</b> If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included.
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	Protecting existing open spaces contributes significantly to the open space objective, by maintaining the level of openspaces and protecting this valuable resource. Again there are wider benefits to health, and creating successful places. It can also mean people have to travel less distance to access open space, supporting sustainable travel.
<b>Representations Received</b>	<b>Question 91A:</b> Support: 66, Object: 0, Comment: 1 <b>Question 91B:</b> Comment: 1
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>Question 91A</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is also covered by PVAA policy</li> <li>• Support from 25 parish councils</li> <li>• Once lost they are gone forever. Need protections as worth more as housing land</li> <li>• Sport England supports policy to protect open space as vulnerable asset given their potential value as development land. Support need for replacement facilities to meet criteria relating to quantity, quality and accessibility. Only support the loss of 'surplus' playing fields if evidenced by up to date and robust playing pitch assessment which clearly demonstrated surplus of provision for current and future needs. Replacement sites should be available prior to loss of existing sites, to secure continuity of provision and subject to comparable management arrangements. Support requirement to consider views of local residents and users of sites in question. Consistent with Sport England policy and NPPF.</li> <li>• Support from Cambridge City Council for policy to protect existing playing fields. New Local Green Space designation – need to work with SCDC to establish similar approach to cross boundary green space.</li> <li>• Should include parks, country parks and all other open space in definition</li> <li>• Need to review to ensure best use of land for local area.</li> <li>• Protect except in exceptional circumstances then could do land swap which favours village</li> <li>• Protect particularly at schools</li> <li>• Scarcity of pitches so high cost to use increases cost of participating in sport.</li> <li>• Important for young people as provides physical and mental development</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 91B</b></p> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection can be afforded by dedication under Queen</li> </ul>

	Elizabeth II scheme.
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>The Local Plan should retain the existing policy to protect existing playing fields and recreation facilities since they are recognised as being important facilities within a community and once lost cannot easily be replaced. The scope of this policy to be widened to include the future protection of allotments and community orchards which are recognised as valuable green assets in a settlement.</p> <p>Great support for having policy including support from 25 parish councils and Sport England who state that need to protect open space as vulnerable asset given their potential value as development land. Some respondents had pointed out that there is a scarcity of pitches so there is a high cost to use them which increases the cost of participating in sport – impact on health. Need to protect playing fields especially at schools.</p> <p>In response to specific issues;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies in Local Plan recognise the importance of open space for health of community. Improves quality of life and what makes South Cambs a good place to live and work.</li> <li>• Protection of a variety of open spaces has been included in policies in the Local Plan either as Protected Village Amenity Areas (PVAAS) or as Local Green Space. Some spaces may also be located within the Green Belt and therefore has protection from development.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/9: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas, Allotments and Community Orchards
<b>Policy SC/9: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas, Allotments and Community Orchards (and paragraph 9.34 – 9.37)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 8 Support: 7 (including 4 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 2
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn PC</b> – Support as complements Policy SC/10 in providing some protection against inappropriate infilling. Great demand for allotments in parish and finding suitable land is difficult.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Protects intrinsic character of the village and surrounding countryside.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Welcome protection of existing recreation areas, allotments and community orchards.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick PC</b> – Support Policy SC/9.</li> <li>• Protect existing open spaces of value to local communities.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sport England</b> – Support principle but suggested amendments, including final criteria should note there is no up to date playing pitch assessment for district. Urge SCDC to carry out such an assessment as soon as possible.</li> <li>• Council should promote new community orchards, woodland and allotments. New site at end of Manger’s Lane, Duxford for community orchard and residential.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Assessment</b></p>	<p>The policy is similar to one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The existing adopted policy protects only recreation areas whereas the new one extends the protection to allotments and community orchards. The Council does not consider that a revision is necessary to the policy to mention that a playing pitch strategy should be carried out as requested by Sport England. The update of the Recreation Study provides evidence of what facilities exists within the district and could be used to assess any recreation areas under threat from development proposals. The Council has now started working with Cambridge City Council, Sport England, and other stakeholders to prepare a Playing Pitch Strategy and action plan for the wider Cambridge area, to help implement the Local Plan proposals and the continued development of sport in the area by stakeholders</p> <p>The Council is encouraging the provision of new areas of open space for community use within other policies in the plan notably Policies SC/7 and SC/8 and therefore does not need to modify the proposed policy as suggested by one individual respondent.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>No change</b></p>

## Policy SC/10: Lighting Proposals

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 93</b>	<b>Lighting, noise and odour issues</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document</li> <li>• Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough Minerals and Waste LDF</li> </ul>
<b>Existing policies</b>	Development Control Policies DPD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lighting (NE/14)</li> <li>• Noise Pollution (NE/15)</li> <li>• Development Principles DP/3</li> </ul>
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that by encouraging good design, planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.</p> <p>Although artificial light is needed for safety and amenity, it can have negative effects if it is not properly designed or appropriately located. The Local Plan needs to ensure development proposals avoid adverse impact on nearby uses or the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Noise can have a significant impact upon environmental quality, public health and amenity. It is important that noise sensitive developments are located away from existing sources of significant noise, and that potentially noisy developments are located in areas where noise will not be such an important consideration or where its impact can be mitigated.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework requires that planning policies and decisions should aim to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development</li> <li>• mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development, including through the use of conditions, while recognizing that many developments will create some noise; and</li> <li>• Identify and protect areas of tranquility which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.</li> </ul> <p>Planning policies should ensure development is appropriate for its location. Policy needed to ensure no unacceptable impact on existing and planned development, and development would not be subject to unacceptable odour issues. Odour assessment should be required to accompany planning applications where there are</p>

	<p>potential odour issues.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> Issues need to be addressed appropriately in the Local Plan, to ensure development is appropriate for the location.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 93:</b>  <b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan include policies dealing with lighting, noise, and odour issues?  <b>B:</b> If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	Including appropriate policy to address these types of pollution would directly address the sustainability objective to minimise pollution. There are also significant health benefits, and benefits to biodiversity, which can also be affected by these issues.
<b>Representations Received</b>	<p><b>Question 93A:</b> Support: 56, Object: 0, Comment: 3  <b>Question 93B:</b> Support: 0, Object: 0, Comment: 1</p>
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>Question 93</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To retain village character</li> <li>• Support from 24 parish councils</li> <li>• Issues impact quality of life</li> <li>• Stop light pollution and limit noise from football stadium/ concert venues</li> <li>• Problem of light pollution – keep street lighting to minimum</li> <li>• May still be problems of odour from existing industrial sites</li> <li>• Concerns over noise from light aircraft</li> <li>• Environmental factors can negatively impact on neighbouring dwellings –E.g. In Caldecote new dwelling problems by being next to Bourne Airfield</li> <li>• Conservators of River Cam suggest policy be extended to residential moorings.</li> <li>• Histon and Impington Parish Council concerns about air quality from A14 and Orchard Park noise barrier causing pollution. Need for site specific policies for noise and particulate pollution</li> <li>• Imperial War Museum concerned if any proposed policy restricted movement of aircraft around Duxford – could have commercial implications for IWM and jeopardise future.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where development is located adjacent to larger roads it is quite clear that noise will have an impact. Why need to submit a supporting statement? Surely, where impact is accepted and mitigation is being proposed, a statement is superfluous?</li> </ul>

	<p>Planning should take on board these obvious conclusions and only require a report where the applicant is trying to show that mitigation is not required.</p>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>The Local Plan to retain the existing policies dealing with lighting, noise and odour issues and to revise according to changes in guidance and legislation where appropriate.</p> <p>Wide support for policy including from 24 parish councils and no objections – this was recognised as being an important issue that impacts on the quality of life of the district. Comments were made about light pollution from street lighting and football stadium/ concert venues; about noise from light aircraft and air quality from A14.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservators of River Cam suggested policy is extended to residential moorings – however this issue would already be covered within the existing policy.</li> <li>• Histon and Impington Parish Council concerned about air quality from A14 and Orchard Park noise barrier causing pollution and suggested the need for site specific policies for noise and particulate pollution. The A14 already has an Air Quality Management Area Action Plan to cover such issues.</li> <li>• Imperial War Museum concerned that the proposed policy may restrict movement of aircraft around Duxford. The Local Plan needs to ensure impacts are appropriately considered. A separate policy has been included on aviation related development proposals.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b></p>	<p>Policy SC/10: Lighting Proposals  Policy SC/11: Noise Pollution  Policy SC/15: Odour and other Fugitive Emissions to Air</p>
<p><b>Policy SC/10: Lighting Proposals, (and paragraph 9.38 – 9.43)</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b></p>	<p>Total: 8  Support: 5 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC))  Object: 3</p>
<p><b>Main Issues</b></p>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn PC</b> – Support as it will help contain the problem of light pollution in the district.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past, Present and Future</b> – Support subject to appropriate constraints being applied to developments in or close to sites of natural and built heritage and Green Belt.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Support policy for protecting the intrinsic character of the village and surrounding countryside.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> - Welcome policies to ensure development addresses potential for adverse environmental effects through lighting, noise and emissions to air.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick PC</b> – Support.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> – Support control of lighting but bearing in mind cross-boundary sites and benefits of a coordinated approach, policy could benefit from mention of ecological impact. Include an additional bullet in policy as follows - "<i>Impact on wildlife is minimised, particularly in countryside areas.</i>"</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> – Floodlighting for sports pitches can conflict with amenity and appreciation of heritage assets. Floodlighting heritage assets can have positive and negative impacts. Amend text to reflect need for sensitivity in relation to heritage assets and their settings.</li> <li>• <b>Home Builders Federation</b> – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The policy is similar to one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination.</p> <p>The suggestion from Cambridge City Council that the ecological impact should be included in the policy is already considered in the plan within the supporting text to the policy.</p> <p>Floodlighting is mentioned in the supporting text where it is recognised that lighting should not have a significant impact on the amenity of surrounding properties. Such properties could include heritage assets and therefore it is not necessary to emphasise the particular impact on the setting of such buildings.</p> <p>In response to the House Builders Federation a similar policy has been previously adopted in LDF and has provided a valuable tool when new development proposals are submitted to Council. The NPPF in paragraph 125 states that by encouraging good design planning policies can limit the impact of light pollution.</p>
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<b>No change</b>

## Policy SC/11: Noise Pollution

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy SC/10: Lighting Proposals.

Policy SC/11: Noise Pollution (and paragraphs 9.44 – 9.53)	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 7 Support: 4 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 3
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn PC</b> – Support but is concerned it must be complemented with an effective enforcement regime.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Support policy for protecting the intrinsic character of the village and surrounding countryside.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> - Welcome policies to ensure development addresses potential for adverse environmental effects through lighting, noise and emissions to air.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick PC</b> – Support.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> – Support aims of policy but consider bullet 4 should be amended to ensure no worsening of noise beyond site boundary. Replace existing text in Policy SC/11 clause 4 which reads "Noise level at nearby existing noise sensitive premises..." with "<i>Noise level at the boundary of the premises subject to the application and having regard to noise sensitive premise...</i>"</li> <li>• <b>IWM Duxford</b> – Support need to ensure appropriate noise control, but concerned may restrict aviation and F1 testing activities. Amended wording to paragraph 9.53 is proposed.</li> <li>• <b>Home Builders Federation</b> – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The policy is similar to one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination.</p> <p>The City Council suggested an amendment to the policy to ensure that there is no worsening of noise beyond site boundary. The Council considers that the policy is already flexible enough to take this into account and the amendment would make the policy too precise. The clause is identical to that within the existing adopted policy which has successfully provided guidance to date in the planning application process.</p>

	<p>The IWM are concerned that the noise control policy may restrict activities at Duxford airfield. However it is appropriate to protect the health and quality of life of those living and working in the area surrounding the airfield from unacceptable noise. The policy would allow for other activities as long as they did not have an unacceptable adverse impact on those communities that are located near to the airfield.</p> <p>In response to the House Builders Federation a similar policy has been previously adopted in LDF and has provided a valuable tool when new development proposals are submitted to Council. The NPPF in paragraph 123 states that planning policies should aim to avoid noise from giving rise to adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>No change</b></p>

## Policy SC/12: Contaminated Land

<b>Issues and options 1 2012 Issue 94</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document
<b>Existing policies</b>	
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>The regime established by the Environmental Protection Act 1990 is designed to address the most serious contaminated sites. The planning system has a wider role to ensure all land contaminated by former uses within the District will be redeveloped and remediated to an appropriate standard for their intended use.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> Policies are needed to require appropriate investigation, and to impose conditions to ensure land is of an appropriate standard for the proposed use.</p> <p>It is proposed that where development is proposed on contaminated land, or land suspected of being impacted by contaminants, the Council will require developers to investigate and identify any remedial measures that may be required. The Council will require best practice mechanisms to enhance remediation of contaminated sites to ensure land is of an appropriate standard for the proposed use, and encourage in principle the transformation of land back into beneficial use.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 94:</b>  <b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking appropriate investigation and remediation of contaminated land?  <b>B:</b> If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	Ensuring sites are fit for development contributes positively to health objectives, and also addresses the risk of pollution.
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 47, Object: 0, Comment: 1
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support even if land is suspected of contamination it should be investigated and remedial action taken if necessary so no long term effect for residents of new buildings.</li> <li>• Support from 20 parish councils</li> <li>• Land around any contaminated site should be tested too to</li> </ul>

	ensure chemicals have not spread outside boundary area.
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>The Local Plan to contain a policy seeking appropriate investigation and remediation of contaminated land.</p> <p>There was wide support for the policy including from 20 parish councils and no objections.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion that even if land is suspected of contamination it should be investigated and remedial action taken if necessary so no long term effect for residents of new buildings. Also a comment that land around any contaminated site should also be tested to ensure chemicals have not spread outside boundary area. Such measures are required by the NPPF and it is proposed that the policy would reflect this. It will require that all land be investigated where a potential contamination source is identified that could pose a risk to the proposed site users or the environment. Where site investigations suggest off-site migration of the contamination has occurred that is considered to pose a potential risk to human health or the environment, this would be followed up by the developer if within their remit or under Part 2 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 as necessary.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/12: Contaminated Land
<b>Policy SC/12: Contaminated Land (and paragraphs 9.54 – 9.56)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 4</p> <p>Support: 2 (including 2 from Parish Councils (PC))</p> <p>Object: 2</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Support policy for protecting the local community’s health and amenities.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick PC</b> – Support.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environment Agency</b> – Support inclusion of policy, but will need redrafting either prior to submission or through modifications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Suggest change policy title to ‘<i>Land Contamination</i>’. Contaminated land has strict definition in Environment Protection Act.</li> <li>○ Need to address development affected by landfill gas - append to existing policy /new policy? - NPPF leaves it for local policies to address when formally covered by</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>PPS23.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Need to cover water pollution (groundwater) in policy – as it stands only relates to health and amenity. This area depends on groundwater for majority of drinking water so important. Many chalk aquifers vulnerable to water pollution.</li> <li>○ Policy needs to address approaches to development on aquifers as well as EA designated Source Protection Zones.</li> <li>○ Support Environmental SPD concept but question title as being vague – danger of being side lined. Landfill gas and land contamination could command their own SPD</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Home Builders Federation</b> – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The adoption of a contaminated land policy at a local level is supported by the NPPF in paragraph 121 and therefore the House Builders Federation are incorrect in stating it is not a planning matter. The Environment Agency (EA) has suggested that the policy should be retitled Land Contamination as contaminated land has a strict definition in the Environment Protection Act. A minor change is proposed to amend the policy title</p> <p>The policy considers contaminated land. Landfill gas is one of many different types of contaminant and therefore the Council does not consider it appropriate for additional detail to be included in the policy to cover all aspects of pollution .</p> <p>The EA has asked that the policy be amended to cover concerns about water pollution and a change is proposed to the policy to address this issue by including mention of the need to assess the risks to human health and the environment. Water pollution is also addressed by Policy CC/7.</p> <p>The title for the proposed Environment SPD is considered appropriate for the matters that it will include.</p>
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Amend policy to read:  <b>Policy SC/12: <del>Contaminated Land</del> <u>Land Contamination</u>.</b>  Where development is proposed on contaminated land or land suspected of being impacted by contaminants the Council will require developers to include as assessment of the extent of contamination and any possible risks <b><u>to human health and/or the environment</u></b>. Proposals will only be permitted where land is, or can be made, suitable for the proposed use.</p>

## Policy SC/13: Air Quality

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 95</b>	<b>Air Quality</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire District Council Air Quality Strategy</li> </ul>
<b>Existing policies</b>	Development Control Policies DPD: Emissions (NE/16)
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>South Cambridge District Council has a general duty to protect its local area from air pollution and produce a Local Air Quality Strategy. Air quality is measured at various sites in the district, most of which follow the route of the A14. The A14 is congested on a regular basis between Bar Hill (to the West of Cambridge) and Milton (to the North North-East of Cambridge). This has resulted in the declaration of an Air Quality Management Area for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and PM10. There is also an AQMA in Cambridge City Centre.</p> <p>The Local Plan will need to ensure that relevant sensitive receptors such as residential development are not exposed to air quality that can have an adverse impact on health, and that mitigation measures are applied as necessary.</p> <p>Policies are also needed to consider the impact of development proposals on air quality, to prevent detriment to local amenity. Where significant increases in emissions covered by nationally prescribed air quality objectives are proposed, appropriate modelling should be required, to demonstrate air quality objectives will still be met.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> The Local Plan must include appropriate policies on air quality. Where development proposals would be subject to unacceptable air quality standards or would have an unacceptable impact on air quality standards, they should be refused.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 95:</b>  <b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan include a policy dealing with air quality?  <b>B:</b> If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability</b>	Issue proposes a policy to address problems of air pollution, to ensure development is appropriately located, or would not have

<b>Appraisal Summary</b>	an unacceptable impact on air quality, therefore directly supporting the objectives to improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution. Due to health impacts of air quality a significant positive impact on the 'maintain and enhance human health' objective is also identified.
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 47, Object: 0, Comment: 1
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should take into account air quality issues arising from increased traffic movement associated with development</li> <li>• Support from 22 parish councils.</li> <li>• Air pollution should not be a problem in rural district</li> <li>• Histon and Impington Parish Council support policy – concern at delay on A14 upgrade. Need for site specific policies on particulate pollution.</li> <li>• Need tighter emission controls on old polluting buses</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>The Local Plan to include a policy dealing with air quality.</p> <p>There was general support for policy including from 22 parish councils and no objections.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Histon and Impington Parish Council support the policy but expressed concern at delay on A14 upgrade and need for site specific policies on particulate pollution – however the A14 already has an AQMA Action Plan to consider such issues.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/13: Air Quality

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 96</b>	<b>Low Emissions Strategies</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire District Council Air Quality Strategy</li> </ul>
<b>Existing policies</b>	
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>Clear links have been established between air quality and land-use planning, with transport identified as the main source of pollutants in towns and cities.</p> <p>The Local Plan could require Low Emissions Strategies, a method of using the planning system to reduce emissions. Low emission strategies provide a package of measures to help mitigate the transport impacts of development. They complement other design and mitigation options, such as travel planning and the provision of public transport infrastructure. The main benefit</p>

	<p>of low emission strategies is to reduce transport emissions by accelerating the uptake of low emission fuels and technologies in and around a new development, and to promote modal shift away from car travel. Low emission strategies place the onus on developers to demonstrate how they can take all reasonable efforts to reduce the transport related emission impacts of a proposed development. Reducing emissions by a hierarchy of avoiding vehicle use, shifting to sustainable transport modes and improving emissions from the vehicle fleet.</p> <p>Further guidance is included in the current South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide SPD (<a href="http://www.scamb.gov.uk/ldf/spds">www.scamb.gov.uk/ldf/spds</a>) and good practice guidance has been produced by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA): <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/quality/air/air-quality/laqm/guidance/policy/">http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/quality/air/air-quality/laqm/guidance/policy/</a></p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> The Local Plan could include a policy that requires proposals for development that have the potential to contribute significant emissions to the local area to prepare and implement a site-based Low Emissions Strategy (LES).</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 96:</b> <b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan include a requirement for Low Emissions Strategies? <b>B:</b> If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	Low emissions strategies seek to address air quality issues in major developments or other areas with significant air quality issues. Air quality was identified as a significant issue in the Scoping Report, particularly related to the Air Quality Management Areas on the A14 north of Cambridge, and in Cambridge City Centre. The option therefore has potential for significant positive impacts on the objective to improve air quality, and as a result objectives to health human health. Most of the measures in the low emissions strategy relate to transport, therefore having a positive impact on the sustainable transport objective.
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 38, Object: 0, Comment: 3
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support including 20 parish councils</li> <li>• Conservators of the River Cam request that River Cam corridor should be designated as an Air Quality Management Area</li> </ul>

	<p>given the number of people that use waterway for recreation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cottenham Parish Council supports but questions inclusion of dust emissions. Can be created in actual construction process affecting soil and in these conditions development should be stopped.</li> <li>• Support policy but in order to limit growth in travel need to limit total population of region and employment population.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Caldecote Parish Council states that there needs to be tighter and more enforceable regulations regarding low emission strategies on building developers, in particular with regard to insulation and energy efficiencies.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>The Local Plan to include a requirement for Low Emissions Strategies to be incorporated into the air quality policy.</p> <p>There was general support for the policy including from 20 parish councils.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservators of the River Cam request that River Cam corridor should be designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) given the number of people that use waterway for recreation. However to qualify as an AQMA an area must have had experienced health based issues and to date this is not the case.</li> <li>• Cottenham Parish Council supports the policy but concerned that dust created in actual construction process would not result in need for a strategy. This issue is however would be covered in controls available during the construction process.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/13: Air Quality
<b>Policy SC/13: Air Quality (and paragraphs 9.57 - 9.62)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 6</p> <p>Support: 4 (including 2 from Parish Councils (PC))</p> <p>Object: 2</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> – Represents comprehensive and effective policy, incorporating all necessary protections and promotes low emission strategies. Site specific air quality issues for major sites can be addressed through this policy in tandem with site specific policies.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Support policy for protecting the local</li> </ul>

	<p>community's health and amenities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Welcome policies to ensure development addresses potential for adverse environmental effects through lighting, noise and emissions to air.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick PC</b> – Support.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Home Builders Federation</b> – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters.</li> <li>• Needs expanding to cover air quality from vehicle emissions as well as development – cause serious health problems. Need to work with City and County to ensure buses meet European emissions standards. Suggest include following: <i>'Measures will be taken to extend the Quality Bus Partnership beyond 2015. Buses accessing towns and cities where air quality is an issue must conform to European emission Code Level 5 as a minimum requirement'</i>.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>In response to the House Builders Federation a similar policy has been previously adopted in LDF and has provided a valuable tool when new development proposals are submitted to Council. The NPPF paragraph 109 establishes that to prevent new and existing development contributing or being put at unacceptable risk from unacceptable levels of air pollution it is therefore clearly a planning matter to include a policy about air quality in the plan.</p> <p>The policy does not need to be amended to address the emissions from vehicles as this is already covered by the policy.</p>
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<b>No change</b>

## Policy SC/14: Hazardous Installations

	<b>Hazardous Installations</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	
<b>Existing policies</b>	Development Control Policies DPD: Policy NE/13 Hazardous Installations
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>Sites that use and store large quantities of hazardous substances pose risks to the surrounding population.</p> <p>The Seveso II Directive requires EC Member States to take account of the objective of limiting the consequences of major accidents in their land-use and other relevant policies. This is done through controls on new developments around existing major hazard establishments and pipelines, and on the siting of new major hazard establishments. A number of the obligations of the Directive already existed within domestic legislation and others were implemented into existing legislation through amendments.</p> <p>The aim of the Directive is to prevent major accidents which involve dangerous substances and to limit their consequences for man and the environment. The regulations require local authorities to consult the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) on certain proposed developments in the vicinity of major hazard establishments and to take into account advice from HSE when making planning decisions.</p> <p>Within South Cambridgeshire there are 9 installations handling hazardous substances and 11 high-pressure natural gas transmission pipelines.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> None. The policy should be carried forward into the new Local Plan. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	Carry forward the existing policy into the new Local Plan. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector.
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy SC/14: Hazardous Installations

<b>Policy SC/14: Hazardous Installations (and paragraphs 9.63 -9.65 )</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 2 Support: 1 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 1
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Support policy for protecting the local community’s health and amenities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Home Builders Federation</b> – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	In response to the House Builders Federation a similar policy has been previously adopted in LDF and has provided a valuable tool when new development proposals are submitted to Council. Within South Cambridgeshire there are 9 installations handling hazardous substances and 11 high-pressure natural gas transmission pipelines.
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<b>No change</b>

## Policy SC/15: Odour and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see trails for Policy SC/10: Lighting Proposals and Policy SC/11: Noise Pollution

<b>Policy SC/15: Odour and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air (and paragraphs 9.66 - 9.69)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 5 Support: 4 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 1
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Welcome policies to ensure development addresses potential for adverse environmental effects through lighting, noise and emissions to air.</li> <li>• <b>Bourn PC</b> – Support but is concerned it must be complemented with an effective enforcement regime.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Support policy for protecting the local community’s health and amenities.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick PC</b> – Support.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Home Builders Federation</b> – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	In response to the House Builders Federation a similar policy has been previously adopted in LDF and has provided a valuable tool when new development proposals are submitted to Council. The impact of odour (a form of air pollution covered by NPPF paragraph 109) on new and existing development is clearly a matter for consideration when assessing proposals, and is therefore a planning matter.
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<b>No change</b>