

| CHAPTER 9: Delivering High Quality Homes | |
|---|--|
| QUESTION NO. | SUMMARY OF REPS |
| QUESTION 45: Housing Density | |
| i Provide no specific guidance on density Support:10 Object: 3 Comment: 4 | ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict guidance only to large sites and via a Design Guide. Inflexible guidance on small sites can lead to locally unacceptable developments. • Housing density should be lower than Cambourne • The market should determine site densities • A minimum density policy cannot reflect market demand for different densities by different households • Would allow densities to vary to better reflect local context • Each site should be considered on merit taking into account local views • Allows site appropriate solutions in a village context rather than arbitrary densities • Steeple Morden Parish Council - NPPF includes appropriate guidance OBJECTIONS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density guidance provides clarity for planning applications • Developers must be given guidance COMMENTS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid gardens that looks like a prison exercise yard • Layouts should not give our neighbours full viewing access to our living space • Target densities should not be included. Plan should provide density guidelines with final density to be design led • Site density policies should take local circumstances and scheme viability into account • NPPF has removed national minimum standards • Site density less important that impact of the development on the local community |
| ii Density target of 30 dph allowing for variation from site to site Support:21 Object: 2 Comment: 2 | ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caxton Parish Council, Fowlmere Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Little Abington Parish - Support • 30 dph offers the best balance of affordable to Market housing for ensuring a sustainable and viable community • Clear density guidance must be given as a basis for applications for new developments, but flexibility is required so that site specific variation, needs and constraints can be accommodated • Option 2 provides the most flexibility and is consistent with the wider guidance in the NPPF • Cottenham Parish Council - Land is a fixed |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>resource and should should be made the most of whilst taking local circumstances into account</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Croydon Parish Council - 30 dph should be the upper limit to allow provision for gardens • Avoids high density developments • Allows for lower densities on village edges and other sensitive locations • Gamlingay Parish Council - Agree with approach but issues such as site location, sustainable transport options and access to jobs should pay a part in considering density • 30 dph based on Cambourne is reasonable. Cambourne has a fair bit of communal green space integrated into the development(s) • Support with caution because it is the lesser of two evils if the alternative is no density restriction. Allowance of variations on whose terms? local people, developers? • 30 dph would seem to be a good average and seems to reflect recent developments. The built in flexibility is important • Whilst the plan mentions guidance, I believe it should lean towards enforcement and reject firmly any proposal that puts forward larger numbers <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing density should be lower than Cambourne • 30 dph is the wrong density for our villages <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote Parish Council - New Settlements should not exceed 30 dph • Cambourne Parish Council - The Parish Council supports the policy but would make the following comments: ii. is the option to be taken in the Local Plan. The Parish Council considers that 30dph offers the best balance of affordable to Market housing for ensuring a sustainable and viable community. • |
| <p>iii Higher densities in the most sustainable locations and lower densities in the least sustainable</p> <p>Support:38 Object: 4 Comment: 1</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fen Ditton Parish Council - Supported subject to final wording that takes local context into account and role of loft conversions and extensions • Option facilitates development based on location whilst allowing schemes to respond to site specific constraints and context • Cambridgeshire County Council - Support the use of density guidance in policy to provide a point of understanding for developers, residents, and LPA officers/members • Grantchester Parish Council, Hauxton Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council – Flexibility important • Great Abington Parish Council – Most sustainable option |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbeach Parish Council, Weston Colville Parish Council - Support • Flexibility is very important. One size fits all was never the case in the past and would be wrong now • Agree set targets based on sustainability and respecting context. Without sensible planning guidance inappropriate development will occur eroding the quality of place and identity in our settlements and countryside • This is a sensible approach that is flexible but also supports sustainable housing densities • High density housing need not affect quality, to fit the maximum number of homes on the available land the targets should be high • Localism. But how would this work? Does the District Council set zoning? Or Parish Councils? • Too low a density will reduce the ability of the development to accept affordable housing, s106 and CIL contributions. All these matters are linked and need to be considered as a whole. If a development is not profitable, it will not be developed • Swavesey Parish Council - Development in villages should provide for green open spaces within developments to reflect the rural nature of the village <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing density should be less than Cambourne • The concept of option 3 is sound, but limiting choice to either 30 dph and 40dph is too restrictive and would add to oversupply to medium density housing compared with the undersupply of low density properties • Cambridge City Council - 40 dph may be too low for sites on the edge of Cambridge as the City target is 45 dph • There will be a demand for low density development in sustainable locations, which needs to be facilitated by the Local Plan <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's not clear why sustainability should be the sole criterion. But flexibility is necessary, particularly for self-builds |
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:5 Object: 3 Comment: 19</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should avoid being overly prescriptive regarding Policy requirements. A prescriptive approach will preclude innovative design, impede new solutions being found and implemented and result in extensive negotiations at the planning application stage. An element of discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances must be built into any final Policy • There should be a maximum density in most rural |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>villages of 12 dwellings per hectare. This can be balanced by building at high densities at suitable urban sites such as at the Chesterton Sidings, which should be developed at >200 dwellings per hectare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation from site to site to reflect local circumstances to be determined primarily by the Parish Council • In the district the range of densities should be 30-50 dph. The density of development of sites inside existing villages should reflect the density of existing buildings. Higher densities should inhibit the widespread practice of extending smaller houses, extensions which could make them unaffordable • Haslingfield Parish Council, Ickleton Parish Council – Agree it is inappropriate to apply density policy to small scale developments in infill villages • Comberton Parish Council – Local circumstances to be determined by the Parish Council • Barton Parish Council, Coton Parish Council, Madingley Parish Council - The QTSQ vision document supports the protection and development of landscape, agriculture, biodiversity, green infrastructure, green space, community orchards and woodland, the Cam, and heritage assets, and makes recommendations as to how this could be implemented in the area around the four villages • Housing density numeric targets are a simplistic tool. What is important is perceived "spaciousness" which is partly about architectural design, and trade-off of communal land and land allocated to each unit • The Plan should look at lower densities in rural villages, especially the infill and group villages, probably of the order of 15-20dph, to fit in with local character. This is needed as this authority is well known for its rigidity with guidelines • The comments relating to infill villages are sensible • Other aspects of sustainable development should not be ignored, like space for sustainable drainage • There is a balance to be had between density and quality of space around one's home. Currently, it falls on the wrong side • Over Parish Council - We do not agree with any of these policies but feel that density target should be 30dph • None of these options are appropriate. The dph in the table on page 123 should be taken as the maximum densities for all developments |
|--|--|

| QUESTION 46: Housing Mix – House Types | |
|--|---|
| <p>i Provide no guidance on housing mix (house types)</p> <p>Support:18 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing policy has led to an over-supply of small houses and flats which have been taken up for private rental and has not therefore been successful in addressing demographic trends The market should determine the mix for market housing Croydon Parish Council, Steeple Morden Parish Council – Consider all developments individually and agree a mix to meet need at the time the application is made Haslingfield Parish Council - Support This will allow local circumstances, need and the housing market to determine the appropriate housing mix on a development and will encourage a mixed and balanced community This is intended to provide maximum flexibility. Parish councils should be able to set their own density levels relevant to their area It should not be assumed that small households need or require small houses. It depends on their circumstances, family needs and expectations Housing mix should be determined on a site by site basis after consideration of local factors and the need to maximise the potential of the site The Local Plan should not provide any guidance but refer to the local Parish Council who will be affected by the proposed development. Where it is a new settlement being developed, the Council should look at it strategically and with a eye to aesthetics as well as numbers of dwellings <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing no guidance is dangerous <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do not believe that the Local Plan should provide guidance on housing mix - the market should be allowed to decide the most appropriate housing mix with an exception for development to meet affordable housing needs where requirements identified by local housing needs surveys should be met |
| <p>ii Include a policy on housing mix (house types) but only for market housing</p> <p>Support:15 Object: 0 Comment: 0</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support proposal to provide a mixed and balanced community whilst accommodating the necessary flexibility to respond to the specific market conditions at the time Bourn Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Weston Colville Parish Council - Support Gamlingay Parish Council - Support housing mix for market housing only. Social/affordable housing mix is determined by housing needs surveys and |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>waiting list data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option appears to be the most workable option for most parties <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> |
| <p>iii Any policy on housing mix (house types) should only apply to sites of 10 or more homes</p> <p>Support: 17 Object: 1 Comment: 2</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fen Ditton Parish Council - Agree combination of options iii) & iv). Consider how to apply in small villages. Probably reduce % of 4 bedrooms in some areas Bourn Parish Council, Caxton Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council - Support Hauxton Parish Council - It is impractical to try to apply a mix of sizes to small schemes We would support use of a minimum size development for housing mix, but would suggest the level is reduced to 5 or more as a development of 9 single sized properties would not provide an adequately balanced community Agree with options 3 & 4. Large houses are often under-occupied. Need for smaller/cheaper house/flats for young couples. Current policy on mix is unviable when there is large demand for four bed houses. Policy fail;s to make most of small sites in less sustainable locations and particularly in infill villages where, to make most effective use of land larger houses would be more beneficial <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "No" <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The trend of people obtaining planning permission to increase the size of houses across the District demonstrates the futility of seeking to restrict the number of bedrooms. Also the size of bedrooms is generally far too small in newly built houses |
| <p>iv Any policy on housing mix (house types) should seek to balance demographic trends for smaller homes with market preferences for larger homes by seeking the provision of market housing as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 30% 1 and 2 bedroom homes At least 30% 3 bedroom homes At least 30% 4 bedroom or more homes | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There needs to be a high proportion of smaller and more modest homes, to meet the need to ensure affordability for local buyers Little Abington Parish Council, Over Parish Council, Pampisford Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Waterbeach Parish Council - Support Fen Ditton Parish Council - iii) & iv) agree. In combination. Consider how to apply in small villages. Probably reduce % of 4 bedrooms in some areas Cottenham Parish Council - Apply policy option (iv) to the development of sites of 10 houses or more Agree with options 3 & 4. Large houses are often under-occupied. Need for smaller/cheaper |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>o With a 10% allowance for flexibility</p> <p>Support:25 Object: 5 Comment: 2</p> | <p>house/flats for young couples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grantchester Parish Council - Support option (iv), but without an automatic cut-off at 10%. • Great and Little Chishill Parish Council - Good for younger people or those downsizing • Villages have traditionally evolved with a mix of housing and a mix of residents of different ages. In order to maintain a sense of community you need to have this mix • This is the best option in my opinion • Swavesey Parish Council – Support, where provision for older people made an allowance must be made for wardens etc • Hauxton Parish Council - A mix is needed • Where provision is made for housing for older people, provision of support must also be allowed for, eg wardens or other local support services • Support Option iv which provides an indicative mix whilst allowing for a degree of flexibility. This option allows developments to respond to the identified need whilst at the same time ensuring that a mix of housing is provided to prevent saturation in any one area • Whaddon Parish Council - Support the adoption of specific guidance to encourage the development of smaller homes by requiring at least 30% of a development to be 1 or 2 bedroom homes, 30% 3 bedroom homes, 30% 4 or more bedrooms and 10% flexibility (option iv) <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council - Local circumstances as identified by Parish councils should always be sought as part of the policy • Too prescriptive • However, this is based on a misunderstanding of the basic principles of economics. The policy does not work in the way envisaged, because smaller houses are a substitute good for larger ones, and increases in prices are transmitted from the top of the market to the lower end. Economic growth is thus not channelled into an improvement in the standard of living, but into asset price inflation • Cambourne Parish Council - The Parish council would suggest a 20% allowance to give the greatest flexibility to meet local needs • The 10% allowance is not big enough. In poor economic times demand for rental homes is much greater • Comberton needs all housing to be low cost to allow young families to move in. Does not need any more >£250,000 houses <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be preferable for housing mixes in new |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>developments to be determined by local housing needs, and would say that policy on housing mix/types should seek to meet local needs for market and affordable housing first and foremost. Parish councils will have a large part to play if this type of policy is adopted</p> |
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:3 Object: 1 Comment: 32</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Villages need a range of housing types so housing mix should be determined locally upon the housing needs survey of the area concerned • Fen Ditton Parish Council - iii) & iv) agree. In combination. Consider how to apply in small villages. Probably reduce % of 4 bedrooms in some areas • Ickleton Parish Council - It seems to be impossible for small villages to see proposals for modest dwellings come forward that could be well accommodated on infill sites. What we see are oversized homes for the wealthy being shoehorned into gaps and gardens. We need some means of resisting this trend. • The Council should avoid being overly prescriptive regarding Policy requirements. A prescriptive approach will preclude innovative design, impede new solutions being found and implemented and result in extensive negotiations at the planning application stage. An element of discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances must be built into any final Policy • Comberton Parish Council – Balanced provision needed • It is mistakenly believed that it is inefficient for people to have spare bedrooms in their homes. In fact, the lack of such rooms causes severe economic and social imbalances. a) Couples put off having children until middle age in order to afford the space to raise them., (b) Elderly people with no spare room are visited less often by non-local relatives, (c) Families squeezed for space won't be able to take in and care for an elderly relative, who is more likely to be shut away and neglected in a nursing home • Caldecote Parish Council - Sensible guidance should be in place to ensure developments are in keeping with the area. Housing also reflect a range of needs from a single person-house owner to being large enough to cater for families. This should be a delegated local Parish Council decision, as the housing mix requirements for the county will not be same for each individual parish • There should be a mix of types of home, including a sufficient number of "executive" homes for those we need to lead our expanding knowledge-based economy |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any housing mix policy would be overly restrictive, limiting the ability of the District to respond to market and demographic demand as well as having the potential to harm the viability of development on brownfield land where development costs are often higher • I would opt for ii and iii. There clearly needs to be some guidance on density but, I suggest, not as specific as proposed by option iv. I assume that public housing (if any) and social housing provided by others will be built to an appropriate mix • Histon & Impington Parish Council - The mix should include a proportion of start up/working from home in defined locations (it appears to our Council that this mix policy should be location dependent). • Histon & Impington Parish Council - Particularly in light of relaxations of planning controls there is a real need to look at housing mix. Extensions convert small homes into bigger ones. Over a period of time availability of smaller homes will decline. To counter this shift in mix of homes, a higher percentage of smaller homes should be built, but on plots sufficient to allow expansion • Current policy seeking at least 40% one or two bed properties is a significant burden on the viability, saleability and design of developments. The wording of the policy must be relaxed to allow developments to address the context and housing needs for each site. A housing mix policy should not include specific thresholds creating developments all of a similar mix. The district is large and contains villages of varying characters; planning by numbers approach does not generate development best suited to each village • Fulbourn Parish Council - The Parish Action Plan tasks Fulbourn Parish Council to seek to have a range of housing types to fit the whole cross section of the population of Fulbourn to meet village needs. The parish council would therefore like to see housing mix determined locally based upon the housing needs survey of the area concerned • Great Abington Parish Council - We support options iii and iv. Policies apply to 10 or more homes and seek to obtain a balance of sizes of homes • Cottenham Parish Council - Para 9.10 points to Wheelchair Housing Design (WHD) Standards. If the intention is to have 'all' affordable and 5% of market housing built to WHD standards then: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - small sites of 3 will have 1 affordable to WHD standard. - 10 - 20 dwellings developments will be 3 - 6 |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>affordable and 1 market unit to WHD standards. WHD standards, for any site, will apply to between 33 and 35% of the units built and whereas the logic is, presumably, that wheelchair users tend not to be able to afford market housing it does seem strange that it is the "affordable housing" that is set to carry the bulk of the additional (not insignificant) cost. If the Lifetime Home Standard can accommodate or be adapted to many wheelchair users and IF the Lifetime Home Standard became the norm for all housing then the use of/need of the WHD standard becomes the exception rather than the norm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The types of accommodation to be provided on sites will vary by location. It would be preferable to retain flexibility in relation to the types of provision on sites. Sites in the centre of towns/villages, for example, are likely to be delivered at higher densities in accordance with the character of the area and more likely to see a higher level of smaller units of accommodation, whilst sites on the edge of settlements may be at lower density and hence include a greater proportion of family homes housing. • I propose an amended Option iv - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes ○ 20% 3 bedroom homes ○ 20% 4 bedroom homes ○ With a 30% allowance for flexibility which can be added to any of the above categories • The mix should include a proportion of start up/working from home in defined locations • Extensions convert small homes into bigger ones. Over a period of time availability of smaller homes will decline. To counter this shift in mix of homes, a higher percentage of smaller homes should be built, but on plots sufficient to allow expansion • Housing mix, particularly in relation to affordable housing, should reflect local needs • Housing mix should not be developer led. Local need, as well as national trend demand should be included. • House mix provision should be given for identified development sites to make sure the housing provided is appropriate to the location and demographic requiring the housing • Option iii should have a caveat relating to individual circumstances. In developments such as barn conversions or other smaller scale developments it may not be appropriate for smaller sized dwellings to be part of the mix • I agree that there is a shortage of housing in the district, but as I am often told the shortage is of the right type of housing, specifically larger 3-4 |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | bedroom properties that these economically valuable individuals want to move to either from within the district or from outside |
| QUESTION 47: What approach should be followed to secure houses adapted to meet the needs of people with reduced mobility? | |
| <p>i Provide no guidance on the provision of housing for people with reduced mobility</p> <p>Support:3 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fowlmere Parish Council - "Yes" • Over Parish Council – Support • Steeple Morden Parish Council - Provision should be regulated by the Building Regulations. Consideration needs to be given to placing too many onerous requirements on new developments. This will increase build costs which will either be passed down to purchasers, or in the case of affordable developments, could prevent the development from progressing <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As with energy efficiency this must be imposed on the developers as it is much more costly to retrofit <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The laudable aim is likely to produce the wrong houses in the wrong places. The District in conjunction with the County's Social Services is best placed to require given standards for affordable housing |
| <p>li All affordable and 5% of market housing should be designed to Lifetime Homes standard</p> <p>Support:29 Object: 6 Comment: 3</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote Parish Council, Foxton Parish Council, Haslingfield Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Swavesey Parish Council, Weston Colville Parish Council - Support option ii. • As with energy efficiency this must be imposed on the developers as it is much more costly to retrofit - enforce it for all new builds • Cambourne Parish Council - This is the better of the options, however all housing should be being built where ever practicable to the Lifetime Homes Standards • Cambridgeshire County Council - Given the rise in Cambridgeshire's older population, housing provision needs to / be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adapt to meet the needs of people as they grow older • Enable the use of assistive health technology • Reduce dependence on residential and nursing care, which is likely to focus more on those reaching the end of their lives |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce social isolation for older people as this contributes to poor health and wellbeing • Option ii) is consistent with policy guidance applied elsewhere • Cottenham Parish Council - All housing shall be built to a minimum of Lifetime Homes Standards with the capacity for adapting to Wheelchair Housing Design Standards based upon identifiable specific need • The proportion of elderly, less mobile people will increase • Great Abington Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council - Support option ii and ask that consideration be given to raising the percentage to 25% • Hauxton Parish Council - This is a start but may not go far enough. If the obesity epidemic continues, wider access will be needed for more people - not just people with wheelchairs • There has to be some guidance other than the Building Regs <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council - Lack of evidence to support 5% figure given increasing number of older residents • Fen Ditton Parish Council - Could reduce amount of affordable housing <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Shelford Parish Council - Achieving lifetime standards will allow residents to stay in their own homes for longer • Suffolk County Council - Standard should be applied more widely than 5% so more choice is available - vital so existing households, whose needs may change, have a wider choice of homes. Important as lack of choice for older people is major cause of under occupation |
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:2 Object: 1 Comment: 11</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst it is accepted that there is a need for the Local Plan to deal with this issue, the Council should avoid being overly prescriptive. A prescriptive approach will preclude innovative design, impede new solutions and result in extensive negotiations at the planning application stage. Some discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances must be built into any final Policy. • Comberton Parish Council - Such provision to be limited to the affordable housing element of developments and then ONLY in response to an identified LOCAL need. • Cambridgeshire County Council - The plan needs to consider more strongly the needs of the aging population and the emphasis towards |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>ensuring people can live in their homes longer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no point building housing for those with reduced mobility in an area where there is, for example, no bus service and no local shop, pub or church. This should be a site-specific recommendation, so that housing can be situated where it is likely to be of most benefit • Cottenham Parish Council - CPC suggests a policy of: "all housing shall be built to a minimum of Lifetime Homes Standards with the capacity for adapting to Wheelchair Housing Design Standards based upon identifiable specific need." • All homes should be Lifetime Homes standard, with a small percentage of these built to wheelchair standard. This would save potential future expenditure on and adaptations funded by taxpayer, via the LA. These are a minimal front-end cost and a very expensive later fix • How would the 5% of all new dwellings be worked out? on an annual basis? would it be 5% of the total number of dwellings in a development scheme? how is it related to scale of any development? • The Building regulations cover these matters |
| <p>QUESTION 48 A:What target should the Local Plan include to address the need for affordable housing?</p> | |
| <p>i The target remains 40% of the number of dwellings granted planning permission accompanied by policy provisions which explicitly allow greater flexibility to take account of market conditions</p> <p>Support:25 Object: 18 Comment: 6</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fowlmere Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council, Great Shelford Parish Council, Over Parish Council, Waterbeach Parish Council, Whaddon Parish Council - Support • We would support a general target for affordable housing at 40% of the number of dwellings granted planning permission. This should be accompanied by provisions which allow greater flexibility to take account of current and changing market conditions as well as other elements of community provision/benefit within a scheme • 40% is well established by previous appeal decisions and precedents • Support Option 1 because this allows for market conditions over time • The flexibility aspect is good • Foxton Parish Council - The target for affordable housing should remain as high as possible • We need a strong policy in the light of the large amount of need |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steeple Morden Parish Council - Support but more consideration should be given to the needs of young people who are struggling to gain independence, but want to remain in the community in which they have grown up <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer more flexibility • Hauxton Parish Council - If people cannot afford larger houses, presumably developers will not build them? • Affordable housing should be reduced to 30% and only apply to development of over 10 dwellings to ensure that small-scale development sites and windfall sites are not discouraged from being developed which frustrates delivery and erodes the local character which is often more prevalent in smaller developments • Reduce to 30% • The target for affordable housing should be reduced to 30% on all sites. The current economic climate is such that viability of developments is increasingly an issue. If the authority insists on keeping the 40% threshold, then it must make sure that some of the housing is made available to local people to meet local needs • Laudable as the intention to require 40% of future building to be earmarked for social housing might be, a more pragmatic approach might be beneficial with each site judged on its own merit • There should be no requirement that developers be extorted, they should build what they feel can be sold. The 40% rule is left-wing social engineering • A lower target of 30% would be likely to ensure that a greater proportion of sites are brought forward without the need for lengthy s106 re-negotiations, which will be of benefit to the Council's targets and the public in general <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested proportions do not make sense. To obtain target quantity of affordable housing, over 22,000 market houses would have to be built. These would encourage people with no link to area to move in, and create intolerable pressure on services and environment. Increase in population would be equivalent to 40% of present population of Cambridge. Creation of affordable housing without market housing is major policy priority • There should be no reduction to 30% • Affordable housing should be for local people |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council is right to have already identified that imposing strict quotas can be self-defeating because of the underlying economics |
| <p>ii Target is reduced to 30% in specific circumstances</p> <p>Support:28 Object: 4 Comment: 6</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourn Parish Council - Support, but the criteria that can trigger this change of threshold must be clearly defined Swavesey Parish Council - Agree with more flexibility Cambourne Parish Council, Fen Ditton Parish Council, Gamlingay Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council, Weston Colville Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Haslingfield Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council - Support Cottenham Parish Council - The LPA should implement options A(ii) and that B should be 3 (thereby consistent with A(ii)). Caldecote Parish Council - Need for affordable housing for local people is a common theme amongst residents. Need some flexibility within the target of affordable housing. Where possible 40% should be achieved, but if in order to achieve this, the quality of design and houses are squeezed or single-bed dwellings are used to help fulfil a quota, this should be prevented. Some consideration of type and/or size dwelling of affordable housing should be given. Consideration must be local, not only district wide We would support this policy but 'very large strategic sites' needs to be defined/quantified, and 'those parts of the district with low house prices' need to be identified to avoid uncertainty Flexibility is a good thing in a long term plan Past affordable housing delivery has been roughly 24%. Indicates realistic, deliverable and viable proportion of affordable housing. Given many sites were delivered prior to economic downturn situation is likely to have worsened. Target should be reduced to 30% and annual housing target increased to make up difference The target for affordable housing should be reduced to 30% on all sites. The current economic climate is such that viability of developments is increasingly becoming an issue. Sites will not be built out if developers cannot make a profit The policy for the provision of affordable housing should recognise the substantial up front infrastructure costs involved in starting |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>very large strategic scale sites. On this basis, a policy of 30% affordable housing on a large strategic site (and in those parts of the district with low house prices) and 40% elsewhere is supported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ickleton Parish Council - Flexibility seems sensible, but there is a fear that developers will try to exploit such flexibility if they can see more profit by doing so • A lower target of 30% would be likely to ensure that a greater proportion of sites are brought forward without the need for lengthy s106 re-negotiations, which will be of benefit to the Council's targets and the public in general. The need for affordable houses will generally be in the location in which the housing is being delivered, but there is no surety that the contribution will be used correctly <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no requirement that developers be extorted - they should build what they feel can be sold. The 40% rule is left-wing social engineering <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A target should not be specified unless the policy is worded to have full regard to the advice in the NPPF, (paragraph 47's footnote) in respect of deliverable and developable sites, particularly in relation to their viability • It appears that a 40% target is probably appropriate for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, but we would support the suggested reduction to 30% for very large strategic scale sites and the introduction of some flexibility in affordable housing requirements to take into account market conditions • 40% is far too high. Indeed 30% seems very high. There is always somewhere cheaper to live - even students manage. So, keep the requirements reasonable - we should be after upgrading the capabilities of our local population to provide economic growth • The lower number of affordable housing would mean that the village would be able to retain its character. Affordable housing is not usually built with the same design quality or character as those which are "independent" and it is crucial that the villages are able to retain their look and feel. Where affordable housing is built in the South Cambridgeshire area, this should be used to reduce the numbers on the waiting list in the South Cambridgeshire area and not those from elsewhere |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>QUESTION 48 B – The threshold for seeking affordable housing could be increased to 3 dwellings or another higher number. What number do you prefer and why?</p> | |
| <p>Support:23 Object: 2 Comment: 23</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton Parish Council - Support threshold of 3. The affordable housing requirement is currently acting as a deterrent to small infill sites being brought forward • Cambourne Parish Council - Support but should be 5 at least • Some common sense needs to be applied, so that a small development of less than 4 houses are not liable for the affordable housing or offset requirements. This will enable fairer competition and access for small developers or individuals in this market place • Fen Ditton Parish Council - Support increase to 3. 2 is too prescriptive • Bourne Parish Council, Cottenham Parish Council, Haslingfield Parish Council, Over Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council, Swavesey Parish Council, Weston Colville PC – Support • Rampton Parish Council – Increase to 10 • The (current) discouragement of small developments is important. They fit in well, do not dominate neighbouring dwellings and should be encouraged. Suggest four is the appropriate number • No more than 3 because Whaddon Village has no amenities and if housing were to be allowed then this village would lose its individualness and village community spirit • The affordable housing requirement is currently acting as a deterrent to very small infill sites being brought forward • I believe that the threshold should be vastly increased to 10, to provide our local community with new market housing that compares with existing local dwellings • Yes. 4 dwellings would be a better number. It would prevent "stealth" development of one house at a time on a given site. The District's new-found financial flexibility with its housing account could create more affordable housing for rent • Moving threshold to 3 would allow more |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>windfall development and provision of housing in smaller villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steeple Morden Parish Council – A threshold of no more than 3as to go higher would ignore needs <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The threshold should remain at the current 2 dwellings • Affordable housing should only apply to development of over 10 dwellings to ensure that small-scale development sites and windfall sites are not discouraged from being developed which frustrates delivery and erodes the local character which is often more prevalent in the smaller developments <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social housing provision should not apply where houses are built for the use of the owner or their family. An example is someone who wants to build two houses on their land for two of their children • Fowlmere Parish Council – Keep at 2 • Increase the threshold to 3 or more, subject to viability, to encourage more small scale developments to come forward • At low thresholds it is, of course, impracticable for the development to include affordable homes on site. The developer has to pay a sum in lieu. It is a question of market economics as to the effect of such impositions on small developments will have on housing provision • Have a threshold of 5 units, which will enable a pair of semi-detached affordable units to be delivered as a minimum and achieve a development that registered providers will be more likely to deliver • We would support a policy increase to 3 dwellings or more. However if the policy were to remain at 2 dwellings or more we would seek a higher threshold (e.g. 5 or more) for seeking on-site provision as the '1 private, 1 affordable' is an unnecessary burden on developers. An off-site financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision for developments of between 2 (or 3 if the new change applies) and 4 dwellings would be encouraged • It is hard to see why there should be a low threshold. A development of even three houses may well be in an area where any affordable homes is inappropriate. Maybe 10 or 20 as a threshold to ensure that developers do create some affordable homes • The threshold should be increased to 6 or more. Small developments are usually very |
|--|--|

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| | <p>tight on profit and imposing the policy of the threshold of 40% on such is too much of a burden, a drain on limited resources, financially unviable and is deterring developers from considering undertaking such developments. In addition, housing associations usually do not want to have one property in a new development, and would much prefer a small number/group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suggested number would be on sites over 0.5ha or 15 dwellings, as per the policy in the neighbouring authority Uttlesford District Council or even their emerging policy which seeks 20% on between 5-14 dwellings and 40% on sites of 15 units or more • Papworth Everard Parish Council - 6 dwellings - any lower figure would make 40% provision of affordable housing untenable • The threshold should be 1. For small sites an off-site contribution could be assessed • Consultation should be undertaken with RSL's regarding the minimum number of units they would require for a site to be viable from their point of view and the threshold for providing on site affordable houses set at that level. For example if an RSL considers that they need 5 units on site for it to be manageable from their point of view then this would mean that the on site affordable threshold should be set at 13 (if using 40% contribution levels). Developments below this should use an off site contribution formula based on the current model, but modified to include issues such as viability. • The threshold should be increased further. We are ending up with small sites which are supposed to have an affordable dwelling on them, but Registered Providers do not have the desire to manage properties scattered throughout the District. We need to encourage smaller developers to start building again, and I think raising the threshold will help this. • Waterbeach Parish Council – Keep 40% provision and threshold of 2 • The threshold should be much higher, possibly 15 or 20. It is hard to see how providing more affordable housing would encourage the economic growth required in the earlier part of your Plan • The threshold should be raised to encourage smaller developers, and enable smaller developments within existing villages to be considered. I would suggest in the region of 7 to make it viable for smaller developers |
| QUESTION 48 | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 1 Comment: 29</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The average number of affordable dwellings delivered is approximately 204 per year. The past rates of affordable housing fall well short of what is required over the next 5 years and also the longer term requirements. The relatively high affordable housing target is not addressing the housing need. A higher target would affect the viability of development, and would not deliver additional affordable dwellings. It is obvious that the overall housing target must increase to boost the supply of affordable housing • Madingley Parish Council – Support small scale housing growth of up to 10% / 5-10 houses • Support a variant of ii: Proportions of affordable housing will, in future, be subject to viability and it is unlikely that the 40% figure will be achievable without external subsidy. Since the proportion of affordable housing will need to be negotiated on a site by site basis, the value of identifying specific district wide percentages is questioned • The housing needs of University and College staff and key workers should be specifically identified in affordable housing policies, and that appropriate sites should be specifically identified where such housing could be brought forward. Land north and south of Barton Road should be allocated as one of these sites • Apply affordable housing delivery or contribution from 3 or more homes, with triggers of one in 3 homes being affordable, at 3, 6, 9 and 12 homes and retain trigger of 40% affordable from 15 homes, provided viable, with no provision for commuted sums • We would wish to see opportunities for delivering affordable housing provision maximised on strategic sites • Account needs to be taken of the viability of a development and any policy should have flexibility built in to it, in order to address this • Affordable housing policy should be site-specific. on number of dwellings and location • Comberton Parish Council - Key issue is not the amount of affordable housing but its type. Social rented housing can be let, often equity share housing stands empty • Affordable housing (policy requirements) are the result of not matching supply and demand, and are a market manipulation via special policies and lending schemes. The total volume of housing needs to increase |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>dramatically.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Croydon Parish Council - Local Authority housing is the new affordable housing and needs to be included instead of the private developers' affordable variety • Housing need should be based on real need and people should be allocated to a property before it is granted planning and constructed. Otherwise it becomes a development led approach rather than building sustainably to fill local need • The level of affordable housing provision sought needs to be based on an assessment of viability which considers all contributions to be sought from infrastructure needs • Paragraph 50 of the NPPF requires such policies to be "sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions". This can be best allowed for by explaining in the policy those circumstances when it will be acceptable to provide less than the specified target. In doing so, it must explicitly allow the viability of the scheme to be a relevant factor • The proportion of dwellings within a development built as affordable housing should be a function of demonstrable local need and a robust financial viability assessment • Providing significant numbers of affordable homes should take into account not only the needs for such homes but also provide support fo communities that have them • There is a great need for affordable housing, so we support having a target. However, the target needs to be realistic. It is no use having a very high target if it is so high that it deters schemes coming forward because they are not viable • Land is too expensive which prevents more self build solutions • A high dwelling target is needed to get more affordable houses built, but subject to viability • There need to be more opportunities for high quality rental accommodation which remain as such • I would like to see the council use the opportunity it has to improve the supply of cheaper housing through regulating the range of property sizes and styles on new developments. That is truly creating affordable housing, but comes outside the definition of the term. Excessive requirements for social housing may result in developments not having as great an impact on property prices and therefore affordability as they otherwise might |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>QUESTION 49 A: What approach do you think the Local Plan should take to affordable housing on rural exception sites?</p> | |
| <p>i Allow minimum amount of market housing on exception sites to make the affordable housing viable?</p> <p>Support:20 Object: 9 Comment: 5</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to have controls on the mix of housing development to ensure that local people may have affordable houses provided, and developers do not over-develop sites out of keeping with the village • Steeple Morden Parish Council - There is merit in allowing a flexible approach by allowing some market housing within exception schemes where this will enable the delivery of affordable units in appropriate locations • Current exception site policy unfairly restricts certain groups of the community including first timers, upsizers and downsizers, preventing them from remaining within the settlement or forcing unsatisfactory conditions upon them. Allowing mixed affordable and market housing exception sites would help address a wider range of local needs • Great Shelford Parish Council - Yes - the point of exception sites is that they fulfill a local need • Toft Parish Council, Whaddon Parish Council, Fowlmere Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Swavesey Parish Council – Support • I support this view totally, subject to Parish Council consultation as it supports the Localism agenda and gives local people a greater say in something that will affect them for a lifetime • Ickleton Parish Council - Any acceptable development in a small settlement is likely to be small in scale and there needs to be control over the provision of market housing where such development is not desired on any significant scale • Endorse the pragmatic approach being proposed by the Council to facilitate the development of 'affordable housing' on exception sites, the level could be set higher than 40% so a greater proportion of affordable housing is secured than normal market sites • The idea of exception sites was to provide affordable housing, so just enough market housing should be allowed to make an affordable housing development viable • Some degree of market housing may be necessary to ensure that schemes are viable |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>so we support option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to make each development viable, a minimum of amount of market housing should be allowed. The amount should be judged on a case by case basis • The Parish Council would have to prove that the residents are in favour of such a decision to build a higher proportion of market housing on an exception site to support both affordable housing as well as the community <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council - Cannot support a top-down approach as dictated by SCDC but would support this policy at the local level as part of a neighbourhood plan • Greater levels of market housing should be allowed on exceptions sites to help provide and support local community facilities • Caxton Parish Council - A(i) and (ii) - Object to both - No. • Over Parish Council - No • Maximum of 25% market would be acceptable <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote Parish Council - The Parish Council should be consulted as they know their settlements and what the community needs. All affordable housing on exception sites should be allocated to existing residents requiring different types of properties and those with strong family connections only • Cottenham Parish Council - The new exception site policy should insist that the first 6 and thereafter a minimum of 60% of the dwellings are affordable • Hauxton Parish Council - Who will decide on what type of housing is needed to make it viable? The market housing should be of a type suitable for first-time buyers/tenants |
| <p>ii Provide more market housing to support local communities. Allow a greater amount of market housing on exception sites to support the provision of a significant amount of affordable housing</p> <p>Support:27 Object: 5 Comment: 10</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support option ii - to address community balance. There is a risk of creating affordable housing ghettos on the edge of villages • Support approach which provides more market housing to support local communities within a rural exception site. This should be set out in a defined policy target rather than relying upon viability discussions. These can often be protracted and complicated and act as a barrier to the delivery of affordable housing • Greater levels of market housing should be allowed on exceptions sites to help provide and support local community facilities • Little Abington Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council, Weston |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Colville Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council - Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to allow enough market housing to sustain the cost of affordable housing but also to avoid social segregation on an economic and class basis • The option that market housing can support the delivery of affordable housing is strongly supported. Government grants for affordable homes will reduce, so other funding streams are needed • Clients would support Option ii), with addition of provision for allowing greater amount of market housing on edge of village sites where this would support provision of affordable housing • Current exception site policy unfairly restricts certain groups of the community including first timers, upsizers and downsizers, preventing them from remaining within the settlement or forcing unsatisfactory conditions upon them. Allowing mixed affordable and market housing exception sites would help address a wider range of local needs • This is a sensible approach, which will encourage landowners to release such land and we therefore support this policy option • Council should consider different, possibly radically different, methods of construction, dwelling size and ownership to address the affordability of housing for Key workers, particularly on development sites • Haslingfield Parish Council - SUPPORT OPTIONS Aii & B • Support, some authorities already have such policies, such as Suffolk Coastal who have a policy that allows 1 market property for 3 affordable on rural exception sites • Rural exception sites should be assessed on the basis of what local inhabitants demand, rather than the councils current district-wide approach to affordable housing • The percentage of the total units which are to be affordable should be higher than for general sites. However, there should be flexibility to ensure viability and deliverability • Option two represents the most realistic approach to development within the rural areas and addresses the failure in delivering affordable housing in rural villages <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council - This should be determined at the local level via a neighbourhood plan |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caxton Parish Council - A(i) and (ii) - Object to both – No • Over Parish Council - No • Definitely not. Exception sites are outside the village envelope so should not be used as development land in the first place. This erodes good settlement planning. Get the village envelopes right in the first place and find a better mechanism to build affordable houses by increasing the proportion of affordable to private within the envelope not outside it • Increasing the proportion of market housing on exception sites might well make a particular site more viable to the developer and/or landowner but the affordable dwellings thus displaced would then have to be built somewhere else <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenham Parish Council - Whereas the current asking is for a maximum of 40% affordable housing on new developments the new exception site policy should insist that the first 6 and thereafter a minimum of 60% of the dwellings are affordable • Why would "exception sites" be treated differently to normal sites? Parish Councils must be able to refuse permission for building and for that decision not to be overruled • Lots of Comberton residents are professional; solely building subsidised housing for next 20 years would be a social shift in village mix - 50:50 mix of social and low cost private housing would give a better balance • Cambourne Parish Council – ii is the right approach for the Local Plan • The continuing challenge is to avoid creating "affordable" ghettos on the outskirts of villages, where the chosen mode of transport will be the car. Village edge developments should be mixed • It is not clear why exception sites provide only affordable housing and are treated differently to other sites. Parish Councils should be able to refuse permission on reasonable grounds for these sites as with all development proposals, and for their decision not to be overruled |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>QUESTION 49 B: Do you think the Local Plan should allow greater flexibility in the occupation of exception site affordable housing to include the needs of a group of neighbouring villages?</p> | |
| <p>Support:9 Object: 19 Comment: 10</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1) If Exception site policy used, it should ensure it cannot be used to circumvent other policies and ensure level playing field. (2) Land should be valued at the same rate for both. (3) Private housing element should only cover the development costs; additional revenue should be used to enhance local community facilities. (4) The developer and owner of the site should be a "not for profit organisation". (5) It should have the support of the Parish Council • Haslingfield Parish Council, Cambourne Parish Council, Toft Parish Council – Support • To an extent it does already. If an affordable house cannot be occupied by a local for a range of valid reasons then the offer is extended to neighbouring villages • It would seem only common sense to allow flexibility within local communities to use affordable housing on exception sites to the best advantage of the families that need such housing <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not practical unless parish councils work together on joint neighbourhood plans • Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Caxton Parish Council, Fowlmere Parish Council, Over Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council - No • Do not support. Erosion of the principle of local communities having preference would reduce the number of locally supported sites being brought forward. This issue of insufficient local applicants for a development is already addressed through current letting policies • No - if a village needs it they should find the space • Bourn Parish Council - This will not be workable in practice • Swavesey Parish Council - No exception site should be for benefit of village • Each village is a community and should be able to control its own destiny. There is a |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>presumption that building must be allowed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foxton Parish Council - No, affordable exception sites should be kept solely for local people and those with a direct link to the village • We do not support this proposal unless there is agreement of the Parish Council concerned. One of the greatest incentives for parish councils to promote exception sites is the clear advantage for villagers. There is much less enthusiasm for opening up exception sites to people with no connection to villages • Hauxton Parish Council - Exception sites should be of benefit to the immediate local community <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote Parish Council - If neighbouring villages work together to provide affordable housing to their residents, the criteria of allocation should be agreed upon at the initial stages of assessing housing needs and sourcing exception sites, especially is one village is supplying land to meet another villages needs. The flexibility should only be introduced if villages are working together. If a village develops an exception site to meet affordable housing within their village, residents or people who have long term employment or strong family connections to the village must take priority over households who have no real connection to the village or group of villages • Cottenham Parish Council - Occupants from other villages should only be considered once the affordable needs of the providing village have been met in full • Comberton Parish Council – Yes, but only if the local Parish Council agrees • Croydon Parish Council - This is something that, should it be allowed, should be decided between the individual villages • The Council already allows full flexibility bearing in mind Section 106 Agreements allow the affordable units to be occupied by any person in need across the district • Yes. Clustering villages is a very good idea, as it is obvious that not all villages have the potential for exception sites. It requires close working for all villages concerned, but it is achievable in the spirit of localism • Such flexibility would have to take into account level of services, infrastructure, school provision and character of the existing built and undeveloped environment at the most basic of local levels to guard against inappropriate development which would not be permitted if |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>the housing in question were market housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each development should be taken on its own merits and the needs of the individual community. Not all villages will benefit from additional development due to the stress it would place on existing facilities, services and infrastructure |
| QUESTION 49 | |
| <p>Please provide any additional comments</p> <p>Comment: 22</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn Parish Council - Keep the current policy. It is not practical to share exception sites • Gamlingay Parish Council – Exception sites are unpopular as far from village centres. Prefer review of village framework boundaries. • Occasions arise where there is a need for affordable housing to serve a village, together with a landowner who is willing to assist its provision but because of a variety of issues, delivery is hampered. A more flexible approach of permitting exception sites to include an element of private housing would facilitate delivery of the affordable housing units • Dry Drayton Parish Council - Support the Council's potential policy relaxation to allow for some market housing to help cross-fund affordable housing on Rural Exception Sites in line with advice set out in NPPF • Madingley Parish Council – Support new housing that will provide affordable housing • Comberton Parish Council - It is preferable to encourage more affordable housing and Parish Council's should have the right to, on an exception basis, vary the mix of market/affordable houses to meet local needs • Allowing market housing sufficient to subsidise affordable housing, would greatly increase the amount of house building in small communities. Such an increase in housing would surely be unacceptable in the Cambridge Green Belt • Most people who say that they have a need to live in a particular place mean that they would like to, which is another matter • Croydon Parish Council - Neither option is attractive, but i) is marginally better • Cottenham Parish Council – Any new policy should say that the first 6 properties and then 60% be affordable • The need for balanced communities should apply to rural exception sites as they do for private schemes within the settlement boundaries. Aside from the financial argument for cross-subsidy, the socio-economic argument is that the community will benefit |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>from a development with mixed tenures. Accordingly, the Council could consider a 40% market housing mix on rural exception sites in the same way that it supports a general 40% mix on sites within the settlement boundary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should pursue 'Mixed' Housing Exception Sites option in respect of rural housing sites (both within and outside Village Frameworks) to ensure good levels of affordable housing can be achieved • Foxton Parish Council, Over Parish Council - The Local plan should not allow any market housing on exception sites; they should be kept for 100% affordable housing • Preference would be regular review of the framework boundary with regard to providing affordable housing within boundaries of settlements, thus negating the need for an exceptions policy • Great and Little Chishill Parish Council – Need to handle on a case by basis • Development outside village framework boundaries should not be allowed • Waterbeach Parish Council – No objection to including some market housing if necessary • Do not allow development outside village framework boundaries, no exceptions. Would have significant adverse impact on transitional boundary, setting, scale and rural character of village landscapes and surrounding countryside. It would give developers the upper hand over communities to build at will & destroy South Cambs environment • Joining up of villages to effectively make exception sites viable could result in out of character developments • The exceptions policy for affordable housing has served us well. We should try to keep moving forward on exception sites with large proportions of affordable housing |
| <p>QUESTION 50: Do you think that new homes are often too small? How do you think we should deal with the size of new homes?</p> | |
| <p>i Not include a policy on residential space standards</p> <p>Support:5 Object: 3 Comment: 1</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will only add to development costs. The effect would be to either frustrate the delivery of growth or alternatively increase the costs of new homes, which will make them even less affordable. This should be left to the market to determine. The Council's role in delivering larger homes should be through promoting a |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>mix of property types, including a greater percentage of family homes rather than small units. Small households do not necessarily want small homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For affordable housing this will be addressed by the HCA's own standards and requirements. For market housing this should be determined by market forces and companies' own costs and pricing considerations • There is no case for space standards for market and intermediate market homes. Those able to afford to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location. The issue of affordability is closely related to standards. Increasing the size of homes necessarily increases costs • Steeple Morden Parish Council - The Local Plan should not include a policy on residential space standards <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New houses are too small - once they are built purchasers have very little choice so guidance is needed • New homes are definitely too small; developers often cut corners providing rooms that are too small to fulfil their advertised functions - such as bedrooms that can hardly fit even a single bed, or living rooms furnished in show homes with specially procured under-sized furniture <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hauxton Parish Council - New homes need adequate parking, but garages usually end up as an extra room rather than storing a car |
| <p>ii Include a policy on residential space standards which would be consistent with national standards set by the HCA</p> <p>Support:26 Object: 0 Comment: 0</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grantchester Parish Council, Fowlmere Parish Council, Croydon Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Over Parish Council, Whaddon Parish Council, Comberton Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council, Weston Colville Parish Council, Haslingfield Parish Council - Support • Caldecote Parish Council - New houses are too small - once they are built purchasers have very little choice so guidance is needed • This is the preferred option, there needs to be better guidance regarding property sizes, and standards regarding bedroom sizes • Cambridge City Council - Given the financial implications for developers, particularly on the larger development sites, it is key to include such a policy in the Local Plan as the National Planning Policy Framework requires local plans |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>to set out clear policies on what will and will not be permitted (paragraph 154) and supplementary planning documents should not be used to add unnecessarily to financial burdens on development (paragraph 153)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenham Parish Council - Adopt option (ii) but include reference to Lifetime Homes Standards (LHS) (November 2011) • Some degree of control to ensure reasonably sized rooms are provided is sensible • Put it into the plan. The SPD may never be written <p>OBJECTIONS: COMMENTS:</p> |
| <p>iii Include a more general policy on residential space standards and include the actual standards in a SPD</p> <p>Support:20 Object: 0 Comment: 5</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papworth Everard Parish Council - Support • Support option iii. Standards may need to be revised during the lifetime of the Plan • The reason new houses are too small is that there is not enough competition in the house building market. A home and room size policy designed to address the effects of this distortion should go beyond national standards. It should define minimum dimensions for a bedroom and a reception room and set aside space for rubbish bins, bicycles and storage. Many countries also have a minimum height for ceilings • Fen Ditton Parish Council - Needs to be location specific. Some smaller flats may be useful next to the city but less useful in Northstow • This is the flexible option, easily adjusted as times and the economic climate changes • This is sensible as it avoids developer led rabbit hutch designs and gives you flexibility to amend to keep up to date with best practice • Some minimum sizes would be appropriate to ensure that substandard accommodation is not created. These are best delivered within an SPD which can be easily updated <p>OBJECTIONS: COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan standards should be for larger rooms and spaces than currently stipulated. It is a tragedy that England's new housing stock is so cramped. Choose the best available European standard • Cambourne Parish Council – This is the approach to be followed in the Local Plan • Great Shelford Parish Council - Many residents complain about the lack of storage space - need for something like Parker Morris standards |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support: 1 Object: 1 Comment: 16</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only increase space if you increase density • Swavesey Parish Council – New homes are often too small • The Council should avoid being overly prescriptive regarding Policy requirements. A prescriptive approach will preclude innovative design, impede new solutions being found and implemented and result in extensive negotiations at the planning application stage. An element of discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances must be built into any final Policy. • Cambridgeshire County Council - We strongly support the principle of Lifetime Homes in new development and the County Council is committed to making such provision on land it is promoting. The County Council is committed to developing in accordance with the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth which encourages a mixture of tenures and forms • Space is not just about physical dimensions, it is about impression of spaciousness, and versatility of use of space. There is great scope here for innovative architectural design. The "3 bed semi" is not the right answer! • Concern about not expressing design standards in policy is it generates too much subjectivity into decision-making process. Without a baseline standard, subjectivity will apply in every case which will give rise to inconsistency and lack of confidence • Histon & Impington Parish Council - Should it be necessary to use free standing furniture for storage, it must be possible to get that furniture to where it is required. For example, stairs should be designed so that it is possible to get furniture easily to higher floors, without having to buy IKEA flatpacks and assemble directly in the room in which it is to be used • Issue is closely linked to density, car parking provision and outdoor amenity and should be addressed collectively. Set a benchmark for developers, which if accorded with in a scheme, would help to minimise antipathy of local residents objecting against new development |
| <p>QUESTION 51: How do you think the Local Plan should deal with extensions to dwellings in the countryside?</p> | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>i Not include a policy</p> <p>Support:4 Object: 8 Comment: 2</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the policy. Extensions to homes in the countryside should be allowed on the same basis as homes within village boundaries, or more generously as they would not inconvenience neighbours. It would be better to prevent overdevelopment of the countryside by limiting the size of land that can be subdivided Haslingfield Parish Council - Support The number of relatively poorly paid workers in the countryside locally is dwindling. To prevent such a cottage from being converted into a modern dwelling could result in that cottage falling derelict. I would abandon any policy on the matter, leaving it to be dealt with as part of the general planning process “Agree” <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The District Council should have a strong policy to ensure against any inappropriate development clear policy is needed in order to prevent haphazard development of extensions Keep the policy. The fact that Inspectors overruled it in the past is a reflection on the quality of the Inspectors, not on the correctness of the policy Fen Ditton Parish Council - Disagree <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 9.21 shows the difficulty of having a policy in this area. Also these sites offer high quality potential for those able to afford quality houses. If they are already valuable countryside assets then they can be listed, thus affording greater protection. But by all means ensure that planing approvals do not allow additional dwellings I think a policy is needed - but a simplified one |
| <p>ii Include a simplified version of the policy requiring the extension to be in scale and character with the existing dwelling</p> <p>Support:36 Object: 2 Comment: 3</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy should be maintained Weston Colville Parish Council, Hauxton Parish Council, Bourn Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council, Swavesey Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Over Parish Council, Fen Ditton Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council – Agree / support The proposed policy is what is actually being applied by SCDC at the moment Cottenham Parish Council - Planned development in the countryside should be treated no differently than development in a |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>village, town, or even green-belt. If the need exists, and/or the proposal is sustainable, then development should be permitted. The policy should be explicit stating that: "The extension to, or second dwelling in the curtilage of, the existing building shall not exceed the existing building in height or floorspace and shall be of a design in keeping with the rural scene"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steeple Morden Parish Council – Include a simplified policy requiring extensions to be in scale and character with existing property. Do not constrain landowners rights unnecessarily. Prohibiting creation of an extra unit would not be consistent with principle of allowing small scale infill development in villages • A percentage increase limitation serves no purpose. For example it does not ensure the existing houses in the countryside are available for local people or will be affordable to local people. Relevant considerations are the impact of extensions on the character of the surrounding area and that should be the governing factor for acceptable development • Gamlingay Parish Council - This option seems a fair approach- a simplified policy but extension to be in scale and character with the existing property AND THE SIZE OF THE PLOT • Existing policy is unfair • The impact to a building's setting must be considered <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals should be judged upon their individual merits and not overly restricted by blanket constraints and prejudged presumptions <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I'm not sure the current policy works, as the land is still too expensive to allow someone of limited means to obtain the property even if tiny. So it doesn't help those it's meant to help • A simplified version of the policy just requiring that these be in scale and character to the existing dwelling may be appropriate, however it still may be too limited and it is considered that a policy clearly stating that individual applications be judged on their merits taking due consideration of the character of the area, local building design and alike, together with an appraisal of the site itself would be more appropriate • Cambourne Parish Council – This the approach for the Local Plan • Options i & iii, subject to the wording, could |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>provide greater flexibility to allow development options to be explored on sites using sensitive design and consideration of local impacts and needs rather than simply restricting development where it does not meet overly prescribed criteria in a non site-specific list</p> |
| <p>iii Include a simplified version of the policy but also remove limitations concerning the creation of a separate dwelling</p> <p>Support:4 Object: 8 Comment: 0</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibiting the creation of an additional unit (e.g. "granny flat") would be inconsistent with the principles of allowing small scale development adjacent to village frameworks or appropriate development within residential gardens (I&O1 Issues 15 and 53) • Do not see why there would be an objection to building a separate dwelling -would that not make them more affordable? • Yes at the moment policy is too restrictive and not transparent • Great Abington Parish Council - Support <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional dwellings should not be allowed, except for those for use by the owner and their family, and which are tied by law to remain under single ownership • Fen Ditton Parish Council - Disagree • A removal of restrictions on the development of separate dwellings is likely to produce unexpected consequences that might be undesirable. Whenever planning permission is sought for a separate dwelling, the request should be dealt with individually • There should be severe limitations on permission to build separate dwellings in the countryside. The prime characteristic of these areas is the low volume of housing to the area of land, and an increase in dwellings - and hence people and traffic - would be irreversible and deeply regrettable <p>COMMENTS:</p> |
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 2 Comment: 8</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept that there is a need for the Local Plan to deal with this issue, but the Council should avoid being overly prescriptive regarding Policy requirements. A prescriptive approach will preclude innovative design, impede new solutions being found and implemented and result in extensive negotiations at the planning application stage. An element of discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances must be built into any final Policy. • Comberton Parish Council – Delete the policy and rely on other relevant plan policies concerning design quality,traffic,landscape etc |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great and Little Chishill Parish Council – Delete the 15% rule and consider on design only • Any policy should provide flexibility of approach to enable the character of each site to inform the scale and nature of development which would be appropriate together with the overall character of an area. Blanket and arbitrary thresholds in policy do not assist with bringing forward appropriate schemes • Whaddon Parish Council – Do not understand the options • Caldecote Parish Council – Most villagers oppose more development within the village to preserve rural feel • The main concerns were the rural feel of the village would be lost if planning laws were to become more flexible to allow development of gardens. However, a few residents raised the issue of policy supporting working-from-home based development (garden offices) • Croydon Parish Council - There has to be some form of restriction on this planning or huge extensions will be springing up everywhere, causing misery to neighbouring properties. What is wrong with the current policy? If it ain't broke, don't fix it • Foxton Parish Council - All these options seem to be to remove or reduce the policy on extensions to dwellings. The policy should be kept and should be rigorous in its requirements • Some of the properties in the countryside are not conducive to modern living standards. In some cases, two or more generations of families are then forced to live in cramped quarters. Therefore, restricting the size of extensions is not only counter productive, it affects families health and well-being and makes it unattractive for those who want to take up jobs etc. from doing so |
| <p>QUESTION 52: Replacement dwellings in the countryside</p> | |
| <p>i Keep the existing policy and continue to limit replacement dwellings in the countryside to being no more than 15% larger than the dwelling they replace</p> <p>Support: 18 Object: 8 Comment: 1</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement dwellings in the countryside should preserve the variety of homes found in villages • Bourn Parish Council - It is important to maintain housing mix • Weston Colville Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Fowlmere Parish Council, Foxton Parish Council, Comberton Parish Council - Support |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Croydon Parish Council - Keep the policy without including a 15% increase in size. An extension could be included if applied for through planning channels. No carte blanche for development • Isolated housing in the countryside - excepting genuine farm buildings - is a bad thing. Almost all journeys to & from these houses are by car <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new policy should be much less restrictive, and not set limits to the maximum size of the new dwelling • Fen Ditton Parish Council - Disagree • The 15% rule is too restrictive. Each case should be considered separately and where an increase of more than 15% has merit it should be accepted • Application proposals should be judged upon their individual merits and not overly restricted by blanket constraints and prejudged presumptions <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council - i. is how the Local Plan should deal with this issue |
| <p>ii Include a less restrictive policy on replacement dwellings in the countryside</p> <p>Support:32 Object: 1 Comment: 4</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new policy should be much less restrictive, and not set limits to the maximum size of the new dwelling. The restriction on abandoned homes should not apply to previously demolished country houses, especially where the proposal is to rebuild them on an 'as it was, where it was' basis • Grantchester Parish Council, Pampisford Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council, Swavesey Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Waterbeach Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council, Caxton Parish Council, Haslingfield Parish Council, Fen Ditton Parish Council - Support • Cottenham Parish Council - There should be consistency with the intended extensions policy and with that in mind: a replacement dwelling, or dwellings, shall be permitted in the curtilage of the existing dwelling to a maximum height of and up to a doubling of the floorspace of the existing dwelling, - caravans will not be permitted to be replaced by a permanent dwelling BUT (unlike current policy), - dwellings that have been abandoned may be refurbished or replaced • A percentage increase limitation serves no purpose. It does not ensure the existing houses in the countryside are available for local people |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>or will be affordable to local people. The relevant considerations are the impact of extensions on the character of the surrounding area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do away with a restriction you do not need • Because some properties in the countryside are much smaller than is practicable for modern family life it ought to be possible for a less restrictive policy to obtain on properties that are being brought up to modern floor space standards • Support this as it would allow smaller dwellings to be replaced with dwellings sufficiently enlarged to use modern technology for energy efficiency, bring up to standard for size of rooms (especially kitchens) and enable families to occupy dwellings previously too small • Steeple Morden Parish Council - Replacement dwellings in the countryside should not be constrained by planning policies that would prevent an owner from optimising the authorised use of his/her land in accordance with requisite site density and design standards • The rule on caravans needs to be retained • The previous policy has resulted in compromised dwellings being designed in order to keep within the size thresholds. There are plenty of other policies based on design and impact on the countryside which can be used to control the size of dwellings • Whaddon Parish Council - We support this option but would like SCDC to consider other ways of limiting overall size e.g imposing a maximum square metre limit <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hauxton Parish Council - Keep the existing policy <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This clearly should be done case-by-case. There seem to be many small cottages that have been abandoned as they are just too small to live in. However, a house about twice the size, if built in the correct style, possibly using some of the old cottage, would not be a desecration of the countryside and could be a decent family home with a decent sized garden • These should be judged on their merits and in all cases be of a high quality • Option ii, subject to the wording, would provide greater flexibility to allow development options to be explored on sites using sensitive design and consideration of local impacts and needs rather than simply restricting development |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>where it does not meet overly prescribed criteria in a non site-specific list</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability criteria especially in relation to traffic movements? |
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 6</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should avoid being overly prescriptive regarding Policy requirements. A prescriptive approach will preclude innovative design, impede new solutions being found and implemented and result in extensive negotiations at the planning application stage. An element of discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances must be built into any final Policy • Any policy should provide flexibility of approach to enable the character of each site to inform the scale and nature of development which would be appropriate together with the overall character of an area. Blanket and arbitrary thresholds in policy do not assist with bringing forward appropriate schemes • Caldecote Parish Council - The land should remain for the same use, i.e. replacement of housing, but also number of properties on the plot should remain the same. There should be flexibility with regards to design, a like for like is not necessary but should be in keeping with the character of the area. • If it is considered desirable to attract wealthy investors into the district to maintain and possibly encourage the local economy then an abandonment of the policy would allow this • The authority needs to take a view that these plots are usually large and suitable for large houses and for unique self-builds. Therefore, option (ii) would be preferable • Each case should be taken on its merits |
| <p>QUESTION 53: What do you think the Local Plan should say about the development of residential gardens? In seeking to resist inappropriate development should the plan:</p> | |
| <p>i Seek to prevent the loss of residential gardens except where it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be no harm to local character</p> <p>Support:42</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infilling can get out of control if not managed appropriately • Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Fowlmere Parish Council, Pampisford Parish Council, Foxton Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council, Croxall Parish Council, Over Parish |

Object: 5
Comment: 4

Council, Waterbeach Parish Council, Cottenham Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council - Support

- There should be a minimum size below which land can't be subdivided. I recommend 700 square metres as the limit. Developments should only be allowed where the new dwelling is for the use of the owner or their family. Householders wishing to build one house in their garden should not be made to build many based on a density calculation
- Garden grabbing - resist where it changes character of area
- It is important to do this
- This should only be considered where a family wants to provide accommodation for a young member who cannot get affordable housing or an elderly dependent needing care
- Infilling should be strictly controlled if we are not to lose the remaining spaces which contribute greatly to the 'feel' of a village, rather than a town and its suburbs. The contribution that gardens make to habitats, biodiversity and general sustainability should also not be underestimated
- Garden grabs increase housing density, local traffic, etc, while reducing wildlife and biodiversity
- Residential gardens should be considered as Green Belt in villages. Gardens help beautify local communities, maintain local flora and fauna and decrease density within developed areas. Unfettered development of gardens will degrade existing communities and contribute little to housing needs
- **Haslingfield Parish Council** - Frequently, the result of such development is two dwellings with inadequate open space for each and overlooking problems. The onus must be for applicants to demonstrate conclusively that there is no harm to the character of the surroundings nor neighbour enjoyment
- **Hauxton Parish Council** - If there is no harm to local character and the parish council agrees with that view, the land could provide housing. This is an instance where the parish council can decide on local character
- Unrestricted development can lead to a loss of medium and large trees in village gardens
- Residential garden building has generally produced poorly designed development with over large houses on small plots
- The existing policy, to prevent loss of residential gardens, seems to be consistent

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>with the overall aim of preserving the existing character of villages and reducing/limiting the population overload of this area</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would seriously frustrate the delivery of windfall development opportunities • Replacement of existing dwellings and re-use of existing buildings within village frameworks should be allowed, but not increased density and building on gardens <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council - The Local Plan should seek to prevent the loss of residential gardens except where it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be no harm to local character • Great Shelford Parish Council – Can result in a gradual loss of trees on site • Caldecote Parish Council - Parish Councils know their area and what is in character and/or needed within a village • This is a question of balance. The current rules have seen considerable changes to villages as Issue 53 rightly points out. It is better to try and stop further loss of traditional green space |
| <p>ii Allow for development of residential gardens in principle so long as the proposed development is consistent with the design policies of the Local Plan</p> <p>Support:21 Object: 11 Comment: 1</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction of dwellings in large gardens can assist in meeting the housing requirement without compromising amenity. A formal policy to allow such development would, in the terms of para 48 of the NPPF 'provide a reliable source of supply' which would form part of the 'windfall' allowance in the 5-year supply. Development should be subject to the normal development control criteria relating to overlooking, visual impact, etc. Such developments may be appropriate for gardens of properties outside the development limits of villages provided the property is well related to existing built development and is in a sustainable location • Cambridgeshire County Council - Support the wording of (ii) that in seeking to resist inappropriate development the plan should allow for development of residential gardens in principle so long as the proposed development is consistent with the design policies of the Local Plan. The NPPF supports a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that the default position should be 'yes' to development subject to the satisfaction of all other material considerations. Accordingly, policy should be written with a positive approach but appropriately caveated |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fen Ditton Parish Council - Agree - but strong objection to backland development • Weston Colville Parish Council, Swavesey Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Caxton Parish Council - Support • Allow in principle, take each case on its merits • Steeple Morden Parish Council - The Local Plan should allow the development of some residential gardens but not to the detriment of the local visual appearance. It is also to be born in mind that some larger gardens are greatly beneficial to wildlife diversity <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of residential gardens has the undesirable effect of pushing up the price of houses with large gardens. People who want space for their children to play in have to compete with developers looking to make a profit by dividing the land • Replacement of existing dwellings and re-use of existing buildings within village frameworks should be allowed, but not increased density and building on gardens <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council - ii. is how the Local Plan should deal with this issue |
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 2 Comment: 10</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving to Cambridge to work and looking for a home to buy, we don't want to live in someone's back garden. Have seen a property for sale with the condition that the back garden is developed. We wouldn't want strangers living in our back garden either • The Council should avoid being overly prescriptive regarding Policy requirements. A prescriptive approach will preclude innovative design, impede new solutions being found and implemented and result in extensive negotiations at the planning application stage. An element of discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances must be built into any final Policy • Comberton Parish Council - Allow for development of residential gardens in principle so long as the proposed development is consistent with the design policies of the Local Plan AND where it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be no harm to local character as might be determined by the local Parish Council • Cottenham Parish Council - Propose new policy: "no new homes" in garden land for a period of 5 years and then reviewed every 5 years thereafter. A policy based upon harm to |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>local character has zero meaning as it is too subjective and nothing more than a value judgement without basis in fact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A preference for the development of residential gardens, especially in Cottenham where historically these have been especially long in comparison to the houses, would be for ii) where any proposed development would be considered in line with the design policies of the local plan, including any related design guides. As designs should be judged on their merits prescriptive policies may not be useful in this regard • My view is for a combination of both options. To allow for development of residential gardens in principle, but ensure that there will be no harm to the local character and that the development is consistent with the design principles. Development of gardens has become an emotive issue, particularly where the development results in postage stamp size gardens stuck onto properties that families will grow out of quickly • Great and Little Chishill Parish Council – Allow in principle subject to design policies and space vs land • Development on garden land has led to a larger amount of windfall completions. In order for windfall sites to keep coming forward there should not be a policy restricting development of garden land. The policy should allow for development on gardens in principle so long the proposed development is in line with the design policies of the Local Plan • Development of residential gardens can leave inadequate room for surface water disposal and/or infrastructure is inadequate to receive flows. The Internal Drainage Board is concerned about this and other forms of "urban creep" and other permitted developments, such as conservatories, increased impermeable surfaces for parking etc • Flexibility has to be incorporated into the policy to allow for differing needs of communities. The Parish Council should be consulted as they will be aware of how much garden development has already occurred within their village |
| <p>QUESTION 54: How do you think the Local Plan should address reuse of buildings in the countryside?</p> | |
| <p>i Not include a policy on the re-use of buildings in</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support option i Such a policy would need to |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>the countryside for residential use</p> <p>Support:4 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p> | <p>be in conformity with the NPPF and it is difficult to see what option ii would add</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The re-use of buildings in the countryside is key to maintaining sustainable communities. Whilst scope exists for a policy, the NPPF deals with this issue and advises clearly that residential uses can be deemed acceptable. Reliance on the NPPF would be adequate • Support i) on the basis this is consistent with the guidance in the NPPF and would not be overly prescriptive which ii) would be • Weston Colville Parish Council - Support <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrestricted conversion of properties to residential use could lead to unsuitable developments <p>COMMENTS:</p> |
| <p>ii Include a policy on the re-use of buildings in the countryside for residential use setting out what factors would be taken into account</p> <p>Support:59 Object: 1 Comment: 3</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, it is important that the diverse nature of buildings within a village is preserved, and this includes agricultural, business, etc • Hauxton Parish Council, Bourn Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Steeple Morden Parish Council, Fowlmere Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council, Pampisford Parish Council, Swavesey Parish Council, Caldecote Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Croydon Parish Council, Whaddon Parish Council, Great and Little Chishill Parish Council, Over Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council, Caxton Parish Council, Toft Parish Council, Haslingfield Parish Council, Cottenham Parish Council, Fen Ditton Parish Council, Dry Drayton Parish Council - Support • Rural buildings in the Open Countryside can offer the opportunity to create attractive and innovative dwellings and if designed correctly, can maintain and enhance the rural character of an area. Whilst in some locations business use is a viable alternative to residential for rural buildings, increased traffic generation and issues of neighbour amenity often make this unsatisfactory • It would be preferable to allow the re-development of buildings on the edge of current village settlements rather than isolated buildings in the countryside • If a building is to be allowed to fall down as it no longer has any use for employment, it is clearly more sensible that it should be converted into a dwelling or dwellings. This must be done taking into account clear design |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>and local character. Not everyone wants to live in a village surrounded by other people but prefer to have no neighbours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should cover the re-use of such properties for any purpose • Better option as it sets out what factors would be taken into account when discussing these types of conversions • In some situations a residential use is the only viable option for retaining heritage assets and locally important buildings • Some rural buildings have been converted into offices which cannot be let in the current economic climate, whereas they would provide suitable housing for young families • Isolated housing or employment - excluding for farming - should be avoided. Journeys to and from such isolated developments are by car. They are visually intrusive, and inappropriate amongst open fields. The fact that inappropriate building has taken place in the past cannot justify repeating that error • Great Abington Parish Council - Support option ii) but would not like the factors to be taken into account being too restrictive • The re-use and/or redevelopment of such buildings should be encouraged and facilitated by Local Plan policies • A less restrictive policy would allow useful flexibility, as long as design policies from the Local Plan are applied • Provides more certainty for applicants <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The circumstances of rural buildings, their suitability for continued use, the value of the structures, the harm in their conversion, or indeed replacement, for alternative uses are non generic and as such the greatest flexibility should be retained to ensure the Local Plan does not unnecessarily prescribe criteria that only fit certain circumstances. Therefore applications should be judged on their individual circumstances, merits and impacts, and this flexibility is best achieved by allowing direct interpretation of the NPPF by the applicant and case officers <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This should only be if the business use is not viable in accordance with other policies contained in the Local Plan • Cambourne Parish Council – Right option for the Local Plan • Such buildings offer the opportunity to create attractive and innovative dwellings and if |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>designed well, can maintain and enhance the rural character of an area. In some locations business use is a viable alternative to residential, but the increased traffic generation and issues of neighbour amenity can make this use class unsatisfactory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not this follow the same guidelines as replacement dwellings in the countryside? • Re-use of agricultural buildings for business use is preferable as commuting by car is likely to be in the opposite direction to commuting from rural houses and therefore causes less congestion |
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 0 Comment: 8</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton Parish Council - Rely on the NPPF which is less restrictive stating that such residential conversions are acceptable where there are special circumstances as might be determined by the Parish Council • Cottenham Parish Council - If a building already exists in the countryside then there is no additional adverse impact on the countryside from changing its use, and in cases where a building has fallen into disrepair any alternative use amounts to an improvement (historic landmarks/buildings excepted). Accepting that there can be no inconsistency with the NPPF the the Council must continue with a robust policy on 'reuse of buildings'to encourage reuse for employment purposes, and which treats changes of use to residential as "exception sites" requiring the first 6 and thereafter a minimum of 60% of dwellings to be affordable • SCDC should strongly support the re-use of redundant buildings. The history of planning decisions on this one is not good. There is too much "allowing it to fall down" attitude in some counties • The Council should give preference to the redevelopment of sites on the edge of settlements that contain unused agricultural buildings, which are no longer part of an agricultural holding, are visually contained by adjoining residential development and well related to the settlement, and well screened from the countryside; over both isolated sites in the countryside that contain unused buildings and undeveloped greenfield sites on the edge of settlements • There is a lot of support for re-using buildings in the countryside. Due to restrictions in current policy, some of these buildings are being lost as they remain empty |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I oppose the reuse of buildings in the countryside for residential purposes, which would destroy the low population density that is so essential to the character of the countryside |
| <p>QUESTION 55: What approach should the Local Plan take to working at home?</p> | |
| <p>i Not include a policy on working at home and rely on other policies in the Local Plan and the NPPF to consider proposals</p> <p>Support:11 Object: 0 Comment: 0</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hauxton Parish Council, Whaddon Parish Council, Caxton Parish Council, Waterbeach Parish Council - Support Support option i) Much home working is invisible and need not concern planning policy Saves on fuel and carbon Support this over (ii) as not having a policy allows for change People will work from home anyway, provided broadband provision is adequate. Internet based business does not have the same planning implications as business use in the past The existing policy permitting office-type working from home seems appropriate. It would not be appropriate for the mere mention of "home-working" to lead to automatic acceptance of such proposals Home working is already well developed locally without any specific policy. Unless this has now become impossible to administer it would be better to do nothing rather than deliberately create a new category of semi-home, semi-workplace <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> |
| <p>ii Include a policy on working at home stating that proposals will be approved unless there would be an effective loss of residential use or there would be unacceptable impacts</p> <p>Support:.38 Object: 2 Comment: 3</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridgeshire County Council - Working from home is increasing year on year as new technology advances to allow people both self employed and employees to work from home. Within the rural areas effective home working will be significantly assisted by the introduction of better Broadband capacity Weston Colville Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Steeple Morden Parish Council, Fowlmere Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council, Pampisford Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council, Swavesey Parish Council, Caldecote Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Croydon Parish Council, Over Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council - Support Fen Ditton Parish Council - ii) agree - this |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>may be a growing trend as broadband improves</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenham Parish Council - option ii) but with the proviso that the plan incorporates factors which highlight zero tolerance on noise levels and fumes emissions • It is important to support people working at home because they reduce the congestion on the roads • Dry Drayton Parish Council - Working at home is an increasingly sustainable option to reduce commuting, and often provides the first step in setting up small businesses with little or no impact on the local community. This policy should be complemented by a policy to encourage small shared offices in new developments, to make provision for the next step move for growing businesses, until they are ready to move to specialist office accommodation • It is not clear what the issues are. Normal administrative a light working at home must be fine. Converting your home into a small factory must be controlled • Haslingfield Parish Council - The community is strengthened by home workers introducing a wider age group in the village during the daytime supporting shops, pubs, post offices and other local services ie accountants • Strict limits on anything more than self employment and visitors • I support this proposal strongly. Not only does working from home reduce traffic it allows entrepreneurial skills to develop. A huge proportion of business in UK is small - scale • Support, but it is not clear why the option mentions "an effective loss of residential use" - how can a policy support home working without allowing for parts of residential units to be converted to use for work? • Home working will help with transport issues, save on CO2 emissions and fuel. However, some specific provisions are necessary to enable suitable working conditions while ensuring that there is little impact on other residences • Home offices and live/work units are important to getting new businesses off the ground and fostering economic development. Unless there would be an impact upon amenity, there should be active support for such developments. This policy should form part of the Council's more positive approach to economic development as required by the NPPF |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Converting a house into a business premises should be controlled whilst an individual working from home will not have an impact on amenities <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hauxton Parish Council - The mention of home-working could allow an extension to be built which could then be converted to residential use • I am worried that a statement that "home-working" could lead to a wide variety of inappropriate industries being set up in residential areas. I am not convinced that home-working in general is good for the people doing it, as it reduces the level of contact between employees/colleagues <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the idea for working from home, but not automatic approval. Every application should be considered on its merits • Cambourne Parish Council – Right approach for the Local Plan • The loss of residential use is usually temporary. It should not be allowed too much weight |
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 0 Comment: 8</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To work at home, I need internet access. Living in a rural location, I've chosen to use a dongle, since broadband speeds via telephone line are poor. The service provider does its best, but the signal level is pathetically poor. Moving to Cambridge, one of the top international academic centres of the world, and I know that the broadband connections would be better if I was living in India • Comberton Parish Council - Level of impacts to be determined by the Parish Council • The ability for residents to work at home is a key part of how an area of high population with limited transport networks and high employment can manage itself in the future. The in built ability for home working applies less pressure on the local transport networks • It depends on what work is done at home. If it's purely office work then fine, but if it means vans coming and going, materials being stored on drives, power tools being operated etc then no. The policy should state that purely office work is entirely acceptable but nothing else - giving examples of what is not allowed • Histon & Impington Parish Council - Working at home - i.e. where staff are permanently located elsewhere, but temporarily work at home, and working from home - i.e. running a business from the home are both on the |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>increase. Both require dedicated space, typically high speed broadband connections etc. but working from home requires additional storage space and dedicated work space. Furthermore, individual tradesmen (from high tech, i.e. IT through business services, to building services) require additional space for equipment and tools, and probably additional parking. The Local Plan should be supportive of working at home and working from home</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working From Home can be supported by provision of local office hubs |
| <p>QUESTION 56: What approach should the Local Plan take to new countryside homes of exceptional quality?</p> | |
| <p>ii Not include a policy</p> <p>Support:19 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This makes sense, to preserve the variety of homes within the villages, as currently • Weston Colville Parish Council, Hauxton Parish Council, Fowlmere Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council, Whaddon Parish Council, Caxton Parish Council, Cottenham Parish Council, Haslingfield Parish Council - Support • I would not want to be a planner faced with the task of judging whether a design for a new countryside home is of "exceptional quality" or not. It is a matter of taste. I would leave the matter to the NPPF • A specific policy on dwellings of exceptional quality in the countryside should not be needed, all applications should be judged on their merits and therefore the national policy planning framework may well allow for the determination of these • Planning rules should apply to all properties, whatever the size/cost • There are many expensive big houses for sale in the District without encouraging more • The idea that those who are already earning far more than the average should be granted special permission to build enormous mansions where others on normal salaries cannot afford to buy even a small house is repugnant • What is exceptional quality? It is not necessarily associated with size or cost. Suggest that all new dwellings meet the same planning requirements and greenfield sites are released only when there is a recognised local need for new housing • By introducing relaxation as proposed in issues and Options 1 issues 51 and 52 these business |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>executives should be able to create dwellings which are suitable for their lifestyle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not believe such homes should be built unless truly exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new policy should be included. It should go beyond the national policy. National policy effectively requires the home to be built in the modernist style. Planning rules should not dictate what style a property can be built in. There are many people who want to build country houses in traditional styles that do not meet the criterion for them to be 'innovative', and a local policy should make allowances for that. Very few applications have come forward under current national policy so there is scope for making the rules less stringent <p>COMMENTS:</p> |
| <p>ii Include a policy on exceptional homes in the countryside</p> <p>Support:21 Object: 3 Comment: 2</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support option ii. There needs to be an identified policy for addressing the identified shortfall in such homes Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Steeple Morden Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council, Croydon Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Great and Little Chishill Parish Council - Support Provides the opportunity to employ innovative approaches to the reuse of redundant sites in the rural area such as former pig and poultry units. The policy should be focussed on either exception design, improvement to an area, or relation to existing settlements. We believe that it is important for the local economy to retain high earning employees within the District New policy should be included. It should go beyond the national policy Caldecote Parish Council - Agree, under current legislation it is very hard for new exceptional quality homes to be built, and the accommodation needs of all parts of our society should be considered It is important to upscale the working population for economic growth. Large homes look good and do not demand much on the infrastructure Where there is a demand, then they should be built. Surely economic growth for the area would presume that such houses would be needed as part of that growth. Not providing such houses would mean more commuting and |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>cause an impact on transport</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The criteria "exceptional" will not be workable; all proposed developments should fall under the same policies • Include a strongly worded policy against "Top executive homes". These are inappropriate eyesores, often sited to be as visible as possible in open country, serviced by Chelsea tractors and encouraging social division. There are plenty of large, expensive houses with big gardens in Cambridge • I see absolutely no reason why those on exceptionally large incomes should be given a mechanism to bypass the ordinary restrictions affecting the building of new houses <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why not ? Exceptional homes have always been built in the countryside and allow for vision in scale of architecture and design that may not be possible in urban developments • Cambourne Parish Council – Right approach for the Local Plan |
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 0 Comment: 7</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An additional possibility is creating an intermediate category between major country houses, as dealt with by national policy, and significant village houses. These could be sited in key village focal points, combining an exceptionally high quality of design with an aspect that significantly enhances the character of the village or surrounding landscape • Comberton Parish Council - Rely on the normal policies for housing development in the countryside along with the design policies of the plan and the policy guidance in the NPPF to control such proposals • Cottenham Parish Council - For the Council to suggest that those with money might deserve special treatment under planning law seems bizarre; if a design is worthy of special treatment then neither the size of the proposed dwelling, nor the wealth of applicant, should have any influence. Planning policy should apply equally to all and if the NPPF allows special circumstances and exceptional design then the Council need only endorse the fact that those 'circumstances' apply to, and are available, to everyone • Government pressure is towards the provision of such very high quality houses in limited circumstances • Over Parish Council – Ambiguous question • All such homes should be of exceptional |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>quality, linked to questions on replacement and reuse of dwellings in the countryside-the same criteria can applied to all these categories of development</p> |
| <p>QUESTION 57 Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation</p> | |
| <p>i Set a target to provide 85 pitches for Gypsy & Traveller occupation over the period to 2031, which means we would need to provide an additional 50 permanent pitches by 2031</p> <p>Support:11 Object: 10 Comment: 3</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council - The City Council would like to understand the target of providing 85 pitches in South Cambridgeshire over the period to 2031 and the implications of this approach. The information provided in Appendix 4: Analysis of Issues and Options does not appear to explain how South Cambridgeshire District Council has reached the reduced figure of 85 pitches • Cottenham Parish Council - The Plan must show the target of 85 pitches but the target should be split to show the numbers required by Gypsies and those by Travellers. It is common knowledge that the two, very distinct, cultures will not share sites so pitch provision is not enough the Plan must reflect the need for separate sites • Pampisford Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council - Support • It seems 85 pitches will be needed over the next 30 years, so that should be the target • This seems in keeping with the expected increase in population generally and would allow for extended traveller families to be together. Care must be taken on the infrastructure to ensure appropriate facilities, water, sewage etc • Steeple Morden Parish Council - Any policy should not appear to discriminate against the settled community <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You have only got to look at the numbers that area waiting for rented plots to know what is needed now. What about plots for our children? • Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council - The Local Plan should not set a target to provide 85 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation over the period to 2031 but instead should explore with adjoining local planning authorities the extent to which actual local needs can be met in adjoining districts • The concentration of pitches in the East of England is disproportionate. There are good |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>alternatives to living in static caravans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cambridge Sub-Region Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTAA) 2011) seriously underestimates the need for permanent pitches in Cambridgeshire. The Assessment was carried out by the local authorities themselves as an internal technical exercise. It was reported only to politicians, ignoring strong guidance for involving the wider community and specifically the Gypsy and Traveller communities • Caldecote Parish Council - Everyone has a right to a home and sites do need to be found for this community. Defining a definite number is not appropriate as unsuitable pitches may be located to fulfil a quota. In addition, other groups are also in need of appropriate housing, such as affordable housing. This need is not fully met by the Local Plan, so it is not by exclusion of a social group when the Parish Council feel that meeting full pitch-demands may not be possible. • Planned level of provision is a significant underestimate. Assumptions underpinning projections are difficult to understand and appear optimistic • The process of agreeing the projections has ignored the guidance at paragraph 6 of Planning policy for travellers and at paragraphs 40, 41, 46, 49, and 50 of the DCLG guidance note on carrying out assessments on the importance of engaging the traveller communities in their development. There is a strong risk the assessment will not provide a robust basis for the preparation of development plans • A specific objective for the plan should to be provide good quality secure accommodation principally for the Irish Traveller community, either on a new site, with the removal of the threat of further injunctions and upgrading of Smithy Fen on a temporary basis, or by accepting and supporting the upgrading of Smithy Fen • As South Cambridgeshire has failed to meet their identified need through the RSS pitches must be provided. To allocate sites such as Site 094 as identified through the SHLAA 2012 process would make a significant contribution towards meeting need • I disagree that there should be any targets for traveller occupation. It is clear that there are thousands of acres of open fields all over the country that could be used. I live in Fulbourn |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>and strongly object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This does not seem to be enough given the large numbers waiting for rental plots now, and the numbers of children seen on our Traveller Sites. In 19 years they will be wanting plots of their own. Many plots are now housing 3 generations <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore with the people themselves whether iii would be suitable. Presumably Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople have a desire to live in South Cambridgeshire when they are not travelling Cambourne Parish Council – This is the right approach to follow for the Local Plan |
| <p>ii Not set a target for Travelling Showpeople occupation and rely on an additional windfall site coming forward over the plan period</p> <p>Support:10 Object: 2 Comment: 4</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weston Colville Parish Council, Hauxton Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council - Support We support options i and ii being setting a target for Gypsy, Traveller accommodation and not setting a target for showpeople The demand for new sites is likely to be very low Reading the consultation information, and assuming maths, assumptions, are correct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 89 plots needed to 2031, comprising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 65 to 2016, - 20 to 2031. Of the 89 needed, there are an additional: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 69 (not counted) with temporary planning permission - 9 delivered - 26 permitted but not completed. <p>69+9+26 = 104, i.e. a 15 plot surplus. But temporary sites, whilst reflecting a transitory lifestyle, may not provide the amenities, infrastructure for a quality of life comparable with the settled community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steeple Morden Parish Council - Any policy should not appear to discriminate against the settled community <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are very concerned that while Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Council have been successful in securing £1m of funding from the Homes and Communities Agency, they have yet to identify any 'acceptable' land for pitches in either area despite the fact that they continue to refuse planning permission for permanent sites for Irish Travellers at Smithy Fen and provide for clear unmet needs for sites in our area. We |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>wonder what purpose was served by bidding for HCA funding and whether Cambridge City will be returning the money received?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenham Parish Council - ii) A target should be set for Travelling Show-people no matter how low the current need • This is potentially contrary to Government policy. If there is a need, site provision should be made to meet it <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need to set a specific target due to the low level of need identified • Best fit is: 2/ of the Issue 57 text: ". ... 4 plots to 2016 .. 3 to 6 .. to 2031, or rely on windfall site .." |
| <p>iii Explore with adjoining local authorities the extent to which local needs can be met in adjoining districts</p> <p>Support:27 Object: 4 Comment: 1</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hauxton Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council, Swavesey Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Whaddon Parish Council, Over Parish Council - Support option iii) • The Local Plan should not set a target to provide 85 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation over the period to 2031 but instead should explore with adjoining local planning authorities the extent to which actual local needs can be met in adjoining districts • All areas should provide accommodation - the settled community has to live where the houses are built, and not just where they want to live - this should apply to all members of the community • Traveller provision - detailed assessment needed on sites on City/S Cambs fringe to provide suitable site and also reduce reliance on wider South Cambs • Cambridge City Council - The City Council would welcome the opportunity to continue working with South Cambridgeshire on this issue, including consideration of pitch provision on the borders of Cambridge. However, in addition to the provision of permanent pitches in South Cambridgeshire, reference needs to be made to the need for transit pitches and emergency stopping places. The City Council would like to work with South Cambridgeshire District Council to achieve transit pitches and emergency stopping places in suitable locations • Cottenham Parish Council - The NPPF requires co-operation between neighbouring authorities thus dialogue seeking assistance to |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>cover any GT&TS needs is both logical and a legal requirement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach involving adjoining local planning authorities is supported. In particular it is clear that there should be co-operation between SCDC and Cambridge City Council and that requirements for gypsies and travellers across the two authorities should be looked at in this context • A wider approach is needed rather than a patchwork approach • Other areas don't seem to be contributing and should • As the name suggests Traveller issues need to be addressed by more than one authority to get the best solution for all concerned, and such authorities may have more sustainable sites <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not for us. We have always lived near Cambridge • South Cambridgeshire has a specific need to accommodate Gypsy and Traveller pitches due to historic under provision. To seek to "push" the identified need to an adjoining authority is not equitable, does not deal with the locational need for pitches to be in certain areas for historic and community reasons, the need to avoid significant clusters of pitches in certain areas and as a consequence a significant void elsewhere and the specific needs of this defined transient population to be accommodated near to their employment and social circles is unacceptable <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This needs to be done in the right way. On the one hand, districts like Huntingdonshire have limited need because of past resistance to provision. It is important that Gypsies and Travellers are free to live in all areas. On the other, behind this policy, is the sense that South Cambs has too many Travellers and they should be accommodated elsewhere. It should reflect embracing and welcoming the District's Gypsies and Travellers and supporting provision for their needs reflecting where they want to live, and existing patterns of settlement and school attendance • Surely the provision of more gypsy and traveller sites is encouraging more people to become travellers or gypsies. This is not conducive to economic growth, as set out in the earlier part of your Local Plan. It has been shown recently on news programmes etc, that these sites become "permanent sites" for the |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| | travellers and gypsies, which surely goes against what they are about in the first place - a traveller travels, and does not stay in the same place all the time |
| <p>iv Require that site provision be made for Gypsy & Traveller occupation in all new settlements, and other allocated and windfall developments of at least 500 new homes</p> <p>Support: 13 Object: 10 Comment: 3</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote Parish Council - New developments would offer the best advantage of being designed and managed in a way to provide appropriate infrastructure and should, anyway, be designed to provide for a wide social and economic demographic to form a cohesive community • Litlington Parish Council, – Support • Little Abington Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council – But not necessarily on the same site • Cambridge City Council - Cambridge City Council supports the delivery of pitches in these locations subject to impacts on the surrounding area and the proposed locations for pitches being of appropriate size and design with suitable supporting infrastructure and access • Cottenham Parish Council - The Council is obliged to plan for and meet GT&TS needs just as it is required to plan for and meet the needs of the settled community. Most new housing is expected to come from 'major new developments' thus with the land available it is natural to target these developments as providers of sites/pitches, BUT the reality is that developers will balk at the concept of providing sites/pitches alongside new houses thus the Plan, based upon pitch provision from (and consider 300 houses not 500 houses should be the trigger figure) developers, should give the option of: "the development will incorporate a 3 pitch site as a condition of the plan for building 300 houses" OR alternatively: " land elsewhere but not within the boundaries of a community already home to Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Show-people , will be provided with planning permission for a 3 pitch site as a condition for building 300 houses." • I think all developments over 500 homes could be expected to provide pitches (how many?) • This seems daring but is there any evidence that gypsy and traveller communities would be better integrated/less segregated if pitches were associated with built developments? better access to services particularly schools for gypsy and traveller children • This fulfils the aim of treating provision for sites as a normal part of the planning system. We |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>will need to be resolute with developers</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't seem sensible at all - if there are sites that can be expanded why not do that - if gypsy and travellers want to stay closer to family or other members of their community it makes sense to allow this within reason • Why should new developments bear the majority of the pitches? • Not all new settled developments will be suitable for traveller accommodation • Existing settlements should not be ignored. If there is no second new settlement or very few new sites over 500 homes, the Northstowe area might accommodate a disproportionate number of new pitches. The previous work on Gypsy and Traveller planning documents included a wider range of issues and policies that are not currently presented as options for consultation now. In particular, a tiered assessment process was proposed. This principle must be maintained. It would be more consistent with views previously expressed by SCDC Members that a more balanced geographical spread of Gypsy and Traveller sites across the district is desired • Support option iv) but not necessarily requiring the provision to be on the same site as the houses • Gypsy & Traveller pitches should be scattered throughout the district and not concentrated in any one or few developments. Pitches should be located on separate sites and also included as small segments of larger developments. Pitches should not only be built in new settlements of at least 500 homes as this will lead to all Gypsy and Traveller Sites being located in the larger developments near the City of Cambridge - which already has a very diverse population. Gypsy and Traveller pitch location should be sited preferentially in areas of South Cambs that currently have a limited Gypsy and Traveller population presence and a low level of diversity, as a means of increasing diversity in an area. • Travellers do not want to live in areas that do not provide the type of spaces they want. They do not want to be in built up areas. Using areas for travellers that are allocated for low cost homes means many fewer traditional homes being provided.. Many Districts in the area are well behind South Cambs in provision. A better solution is to offer proper housing. • Whilst there is a need to ensure that large |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>developments provide balanced communities which are self sustaining and forward thinking, a blanket policy requiring Gypsy and Traveller site provision at all such developments would ignore the circumstances of each development. What is important to understand with pitch provision is the actual location required by future occupiers and precisely what the need is. Imposing pitches in areas for which there is no need will not deliver useable pitches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These pitches should not be concentrated in only new developments, rather they should be widely scattered • The integration of the sites within large scale developments could lead to conflict between communities and the unfair use of services <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The desk-based arithmetic modelling in the 2011 GTAA approach is highly dependent on assumptions which do not reflect the evidence and our knowledge of the Gypsy and Traveller communities. We dispute the 40% reduction in unauthorised (caravan) need, unreliable counts for caravans on unauthorised sites or encampments, overcrowding on private pitches and the demand for pitches by G&Ts wishing to move out of bricks & mortar into private sites. Discounting need shows a complete misunderstanding of the culture and way of life of this group. Travellers choose to live in large extended family groups not in arbitrarily designated sites. • Site provision within new settlements and major sites should be part of the policy, subject to three caveats. It must not justify delay. The shortage of accommodation and housing stress is acute. Deliverable and developable sites are needed immediately, not when the new settlements and major sites are developed. Provision within them should not be an excuse to refuse permission for appropriate development elsewhere, nor for disrupting existing patterns of settlement and school attendance. Thirdly, site provision should be a planning obligation requirement to bring more resources into site provision in the district, without being dependent on public funding • There should be provision alongside all new housing developments for sites • Explore with the people themselves whether iii would be suitable. Presumably Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople have a desire to live in South Cambridgeshire when they are not travelling |
|--|--|

Please provide any comments

Support:2
Object: 4
Comment: 21

COMMENTS:

- **Homes and Communities Agency** – Is providing resources to enable new provision across the country
- **Haslingfield Parish Council** - Support
- In the 2011 GT Sub-region Needs Assessment, the turnover of pitches on public sites is the only part of the model which takes account of movement between bricks & mortar housing and caravans. Our experience is that a significant part of the demand for new pitches is from Gypsies & Travellers moving from bricks & mortar into private sites. We consider the numbers seriously underestimate the numbers involved. Since despite strong guidance there was no consultation with either the wider community or Gypsies and Travellers, we have no confidence in the statements of need
- **Caldecote Parish Council** - Where possible temporary traveller sites should be converted to permanent sites as local infrastructure and needs should already be in place. Given that no suitable sites have been found in recent consultations, it seems unlikely that there will be appropriate sites in existing settlements. Furthermore, because of tensions between travelling and non-travelling communities placing a travellers site within an existing settlement may result in social exclusion. Due to tensions between travelling and non-travelling communities consistent policies must be in place and adhered to, to ensure protection of both communities and to aid social inclusion.
- **Comberton Parish Council** - Aim to provide for Travelling Show people of 4 plots to 2016 and an additional 3 to 6 plots to 2031 and 85 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller occupation over the period to 2031
- Any proposals should be brought forward on the basis that location is a key criteria and that the design and merits of the individual applications are considered with the same checklist that any development is required to match, in terms of quality of design, drainage and screening etc
- **Croydon Parish Council** - Consideration should be given to this minority community, but not to the detriment of the majority. The best way to do this is debateable
- **Environment Agency** - Any policy developed should incorporate the requirement for any site to be served by appropriate water and waste

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>water facilities. This inclusion is required, not only to ensure the sites are sustainable, but also to reduce the possibility of localised pollution incidents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grantchester Parish Council - Providing an additional 50 permanent pitches by 2031 is undeliverable • Great Abington Parish Council - The creation of Gypsy and Traveller sites should be restricted to small numbers of pitches so that local communities do not feel threatened or overwhelmed by large numbers of Gypsies and Travellers • Huntingdonshire District Council - The issues are set out in the Issues and Options document (Issue 57) in a somewhat different manner from that set out in Huntingdonshire District Council's own Strategic Options and Policies consultation. Ongoing discussion between Councils is supported • Consultation document ignores significant deprivation of Gypsy and Traveller communities, and stress relating to accommodation • Specific Transit site for 6 caravans should be provided near Addenbrooke`s Hospital • The provision of accommodation for Gypsies, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople should include a reference to the quality of site provision for this group who are often marginalised and suffer from lack of infrastructure such as drainage or transport. This is the case with sites adjacent to East Chesterton where the needs of a settled traveller community have not been met or considered. In particular, the policy should address the long-standing need for adequate and unrestricted access for heavy vehicles, and the provision of mains drainage, to Chesterton Fen • I think it is important that provision of pitches for caravans etc isn't taken advantage of to effectively provide homes without having to pay rates or incur the usual costs and restrictions associated with the housing market • It is about time travellers were treated equally and not as some second class (or worse) citizen, It is fine to talk of building a whole new village and also to build brand new housing estates but not to let travellers live on their own land? planning permission is granted all around them for new houses yet travellers have to make do with temp permission for years? we are all human and should be treated as |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>such. we can all live together peacefully if these man made barriers are broken down that separate us</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Given that the identified need in St Edmundsbury is significantly lower than South Cambridgeshire, the Borough Council is unlikely to support an approach in which some of the South Cambridgeshire's locally identified need is provided for in St Edmundsbury. It is considered that this approach would potentially be directing people to where they do not want or need to live. It is also considered important to make provision for transit sites • Waterbeach Parish Council - Smaller sites with fewer pitches are preferable to large sites |
| <p>QUESTION 58: How should the Local Plan address the needs of dwellings to support rural enterprises?</p> | |
| <p>i. Include a policy which sets out the circumstances in which it will be acceptable to build a new home for an employee of a rural based enterprise</p> <p>Support: 24 Object: 2 Comment: 3</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If someone needs to live close to a rural employer then this seems a good idea within reason. It could have a 'worker use only' restriction • Weston Colville Parish Council, Swavesey Parish Council, Caldecote Parish Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, Great Abington Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council, Haslingfield Parish Council - Support • The Local Plan should include a policy based upon the previous provisions set out in PPS7 • This is line with the character and history of the region, and the needs of rural enterprises should be supported • A policy additional to the NPPF is required to ensure positive management of the countryside and in particular the Green Belt and edges of cities and towns, where demand for countryside recreation is highest. It should allow limited residential accommodation for those who manage recreational sites, such as at Milton Country Park and Coton Countryside Reserve, so as to ensure more sustainable, increased site surveillance and to help the prevention of anti-social behaviour • Croydon Parish Council - This policy could be open to abuse and so must be rigorously applied. If the rural based enterprise folds, what happens to the associated property? A dwelling has been erected in the countryside where it otherwise would not have been allowed |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is likely to be hotly contested, so a clear policy is essential to remove any possible doubt <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cottenham Parish Council - i) is an outdated criteria-based option The circumstances behind the need and appropriateness for dwellings associated with rural based enterprises are non generic and as such the greatest flexibility should be retained to ensure the Local Plan does not unnecessarily prescribe criteria that only fit certain circumstances. Such applications should be left able to be judged on their individual circumstances, merits and impacts, this flexibility is best retained by allowing direct interpretation of the NPPF by the applicant and case officers <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Cambridgeshire has a lot of rural based enterprises and a policy that sets the circumstances in which it is acceptable to build new homes in the countryside to fulfil this requirement should be developed, however it should not be too dissimilar from the one for high quality countryside dwellings, ie that these be judged on their merits and the high quality of their design as might be outlined within the local design statements and design guide Cambourne Parish Council – i) should be addressed in the Local Plan |
| <p>ii Not include a policy and rely upon the policy guidance in the NPPF</p> <p>Support:12 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p> | <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You don't need an extra policy, NPPF is enough Papworth Everard Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Steeple Morden Parish Council, Fowlmere Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Over Parish Council, Caxton Parish Council - Support The circumstances to support a new house in the countryside would need to be examined in a case by case manner. It should not be ruled out by Policy as at present Related to questions I&O1 questions 56 and 54 which state that the same criteria used for replacement and reuse of dwellings in the countryside could be used for this dwellings to support rural based enterprises <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cottenham Parish Council - ii) is arguably too vague to guarantee the open minded approach now required. The NPPF says plans should avoid new, isolated, homes in the countryside |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>but there's no attempt to define 'isolation'</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> |
| <p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 0 Comment: 4</p> | <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can only think of one set of circumstances where it could be necessary for an employee to be housed adjacent or close to a rural enterprise. A herdsman or anyone concerned with looking after animals • Comberton Parish Council - Include a policy which is consistent with the guidance in the NPPF and sets out the circumstances in which it will be acceptable to build a new home for an employee of a rural based enterprise • Cottenham Parish Council - If the Council permits or has permitted the erection of agricultural buildings (livestock or storage), stable blocks, light industrial units, or 'other' places of business then permission should be granted for any associated residential unit applied for providing the 'need' is reasonable and a dwelling does not already exist (e.g. a second rural home on the same farm would not qualify). Rationale: in this day and age of higher rural theft and lower levels of policing property owners should be given the right to take all steps necessary to protect their investments including the right to live/employ someone to live on the site of that investment • South Cambridgeshire rural enterprises are not of the type to require isolated new homes; there are no hill farmers, logging enterprises or large fisheries. Rural enterprises in South Cambs tend to be highly technical and do not require workers to be "on call" close to such work |
| <p>Questionnaire Q7: How important is affordable housing, and where evidence shows that a rural exception scheme cannot be adequately funded, should the Council consider the inclusion of some full market value homes in the scheme to cross-subsidise the affordable homes?</p> | |
| <p>Comment: 649</p> <p>(Plus 301 Comberton petitioners of which of which 267 signatories have been individually registered)</p> | <p>COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of affordable housing is important • Including affordable homes with full market value homes in developments is reasonable and helps integrate and balance communities • All schemes should have a mix of private / |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>housing association homes to prevent "ghettos" from forming and inclusion of full market value homes maybe the only way sufficient homes can be built</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing important, so include small numbers of market houses if necessary on exception sites (<50%). • All these sites should have a 50:50 mix of both full market value houses and affordable houses • SCDC should consider exception sites to be genuinely 'exceptional' and they should only be permitted when a local Parish need is identified and supported by its Parish Council. Some full market value houses might have to be allowed on a site specific mix to permit this under local remit if government subsidies are insufficient. • The provision of adequate affordable housing is critical and so I would support the inclusion of some full market value homes in affordable housing rural exception schemes to provide adequate cross-subsidy • Only as a true exception to the norm, and only in cases where a local Parish need is identified and supported by its Parish Council. What is lacking are rented properties and not properties for shared equity. These are often vacant for long periods after being built. • We consider mixed housing is quite acceptable to subsidise affordable housing. However this would only be practical if there are equal numbers of local authority / housing trust rented properties and private housing mixed together on the same estate • This is a logical solution, provided the proportion of full market value homes remains small relative to the amount of affordable housing • I have no issue with this as long as the developments do not exceed 10 units in size total, other comments refer to upper limits of 5 units and 12 units • I support the idea of extending Rural Exception Sites, to include houses for sale as a means of delivering and funding the affordable homes. Equally, the decision to build [or not] should be taken by the village concerned not the District Council; give power directly to those impacted by the decision. • Full market homes could be used to subsidise a scheme but only where those homes are subject to the same quality rules as the affordable homes. Full market value homes often get smaller gardens and more bedrooms packed into the same space as developers are |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>not subject to the same rules.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think that combining full market value homes in a new development to cross-subsidise affordable homes is entirely appropriate. • Affordable housing is very important - so many people are 'trapped' into renting instead. If full market value house help to create affordable homes too, then it seems reasonable to include them <p>COMMENTS OBJECTING:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No • Homes outside this area would be cheaper and more affordable • These schemes will be abused by speculators, estate agents and others at the slightest opportunity if they are not legally limited for local use only. Large "ghetto" schemes on the edge of villages do not appear to be an attractive idea • Very Important, no cross subsidies • A policy of retaining all exception site housing for rent is essential • Inclusion of houses for sale to finance a scheme is a backdoor route to development • Affordable housing is best segregated from full market value homes as one has an adverse effect on the value of the other • There is no such thing as affordable housing • No need for more affordable housing in Comberton. It appears that present affordable housing has not been filled by village incumbents, for whom they were purportedly built, but by poor families from elsewhere • No private housing should be allowed with exception sites under any circumstances. The Government should face up to its responsibilities and provide adequate funding given they sold the council housing stock! • People with large houses don't want to live next to 'social' housing • No. This distorts the market and may blight the value of the houses for sale • Exception sites should be just that. I would not support the development of mixed full cost housing with social housing. Why would a landowner be prepared to accept a low fixed price for his land in those circumstances? We would get less sites coming forward. A mix of for rent and shared ownership housing has worked well and should continue to be used to fill a funding gap. • Exception sites should not include other |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>homes. These are usually sites not due for development and this would allow building through the back door</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only affordable housing. No use of Green Belt land for market value new houses • The term affordable is a slanted term, what is meant is subsidised. Either by a developer through the council, therefore charging more for open market houses, or by housing associations. Most subsidised houses are lived in by those on benefit, i.e. no job creation. Therefore not part of SCDC plan. The government subsidise housing associations. No rural exceptions. Not shared equity • There is a real danger that affordable housing schemes can become diluted by permitting full market value houses to be included in the scheme thus reducing the proportion of affordables. In any such scheme the importance and percentage of affordable houses must be protected. • Why should the price of homes be increased to cover so-called affordable homes. Build more small homes, but let them all be at the "proper" cost, even when owned by housing associations • Affordable housing in villages allows the need for a car, or really flexible transport. Is it right to make a car a necessary condition? Best to concentrate on the provision in new towns / villages • No subsidy of affordable homes whatsoever! Why should she contribute to affordable homes when the occupants are often on benefits. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at Council owned land within villages and infill sites • IF 'Market Value' housing is included it MUST be small scale, bungalows or for people who are looking to downsize • Hanley Grange should be treated as an exception site • Local people should decide • The needs of all families residing in the area, now and in the future, must be taken into account. • Exception sites house local people and are preferred to affordable housing on allocated sites which do not do so. • If you have to subsidise affordable houses, they are not really affordable. Use imaginative schemes to build cheaply and keep all costs |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>down</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RURAL EXCEPTION SITES - The need for these sites and their size, should be left to be identified by the village Parish Councils. Imposing large developments onto villages will not meet the needs of local residents • Young local people cannot afford 'affordable housing' • If one village needs affordable housing one should be flexible about the location within +/- 5 miles (reasonable cycling or public transport distance). • Yes, but what do you mean by some - must have upper limit • Very important, and Yes, but not at the price of the Green Belt. • The question should be 'do you mind if we build a big, new council estate on the outskirts of your village - we promise we'll whack in a few nice houses to drag the standard up?' • Stop encouraging people into the area to keep local housing more affordable. • Affordable to Who? these type of house are only cheaper to the first buyer then they are at normal prices therefore the first buyer makes a big profit. Its a con to allow houses to be built. • The policy of allowing private market housing may have the effect of reducing the availability of exception sites, as landowners will wait to see if the proposed site could be considered as a wholly market site. The policy of allowing market housing on exception sites is of some concern if it leads to an increase in the cost of land for affordable housing. Some mix of housing tenures is valuable. Private housing should be private rented rather than owner occupied. Market housing should be restricted to 20% • Don't build so-called affordable houses in unaffordable areas which promotes ill-feeling. Low cost housing should be built on low cost land • Is new affordable housing presently required? The new affordable houses in Butterfield Close, Bassingbourn cannot be sold. <p>PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton Parish Council - Supported by 301 signatories (of which 267 signatories have been individually registered). Affordable housing is important - but permission to allow for affordable housing on exception sites should only be permitted if the Parish Council |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>deems that this is a good solution based on local circumstances. Exception sites adjoining two Parishes should require the support of both parishes before progression. A maximum threshold might need to be set on a per Parish basis. SCDC should consider exception sites to be genuinely 'exceptional' - and only permitted when a local Parish need is identified and supported by its Parish Council. It should be noted that Comberton's local demand for truly affordable housing is for rented properties - not shared equity. Some full market value houses might have to be allowed on a site specific mix to permit this under local remit if central or local government subsidies are insufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linton Parish Council - Affordable housing is important, but there is concern as to what exactly is affordable housing. If a house can be built and sold, then it is affordable by definition. Affordable housing needs to be defined better. Young people, for whom affordable housing was first considered, in many cases are unable to afford buying, or will not get a property for rent because they will not be a priority. Full market homes should never be included in such developments as this is open to developer abuse. • Hildersham Parish Council - Exception sites- In the context of the Council's answer to question 5, the proposal does not seem unreasonable • Duxford Parish Council - This is critical. Further it will allow more integrated development of exception sites to add to the village amenity • Great and Little Chishill Parish Council - Economic reality is that housing associations may need the inclusion of some market housing to achieve financial viability. This would be acceptable as long as the guidelines / rules on the affordable / market housing mix are rigorous • Babraham Parish Council - Affordable housing is very important and there is not enough of it. We think the council should consider the inclusion of some full market value homes especially if this will keep the rents down for the affordable homes • Barton Parish Council - Support the idea of rural exception schemes. In Barton the shared equity scheme for sheltered housing works well • Hatley Parish Council - No rural exception sites. Due to the very limited services available |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>to the Hatleys, additional affordable housing is not appropriate to such a small community. Also, when you add the possibility of 'houses for sale', it immediately adds a powerful financial incentive to local plot owners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shepreth Parish Council – yes it should |
|--|---|