



Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examinations Matters and Issues Statement

Representor **Commercial Estates Group**
CCLP ID **5423**
SCDC ID **17653**
Prepared by **Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners**
Date **16 January 2015**

Matter 8 Housing Land Supply and Delivery (Tuesday 17 March – Thursday 19 March 2015)

1.0 **Matter 8A: Are the housing trajectories realistic; will they deliver the number of new homes expected, within the Plan Period?**

i. Are the expectations for existing permissions and new allocations reasonable? Is there too much reliance on new settlements and will this prejudice the delivery of new housing in the plan period. (NB representations regarding individual sites will be heard at a later hearing).

1.1 No. A detailed review of the issues surrounding this question was set out in CEG's original representations¹. Based on this, and a refreshed analysis included at Annexe A of this Matters Statement, the expectations for existing permissions and new allocations are not reasonable because:

- 1 The new allocations in the form of new settlements in South Cambridgeshire (e.g, Northstowe, Waterbeach) are utilising build out rates which are far in excess of that experienced elsewhere in the HMA, including at Cambourne and on equivalently-sized sites generally.
- 2 In some cases lead-in times are over-optimistic, given the inevitable complexity associated with bringing forward development and requirements for up-front infrastructure, particularly with new settlements.

¹ Please see the CEG Housing and Employment Technical Assessment paras 6.33-6.65, pp 72-80
https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/draft_submission/reps/28102%204%20NLP%20Housing%20and%20Employment%20Technical%20Assessment.pdf

This leads to significant question marks over the reliance of both Plans on delivery of infrastructure schemes over which there are uncertainties over both delivery, funding and timescales – matters that were explored at length in respect of Matter 5.

- 3 There are also number of errors in respect of individual assumptions on sites in the trajectory. Amongst other things, both of the Councils have made a number of errors in utilising gross instead of net figures where existing permissions include demolition, amounting to an over-estimate of circa 200 units.

1.2 Overall, there is too much reliance on the delivery of new settlements which will prejudice the delivery of new housing in the plan period for the reasons set out above.

1.3 This is important because relying on over-optimistic lead-in times and the delivery of unrealistic build out rates will cause the HMA to slip in maintaining its housing trajectory and will mean the quantum of dwellings set out will not be delivered. The assumed build rates for the largest allocations should be reduced to no more than 250 dwellings as a more realistic estimate. If this creates a shortfall in delivery, more sites must be included in the housing trajectory to counteract the shortfall.

1.4 In relation to the new allocations, sites GB1 and GB2 proposed on land being promoted by CEG, are considered to have reasonable assumed delivery rates.

ii. Is there sufficient flexibility to deal with changing circumstances and/or uncertainty over when allocations will come forward for development?

1.5 No. NLP's analysis of the housing trajectory for the Cambridge HMA shows that there is not sufficient housing land supply to meet even the Councils' target of 33,000 dwellings, at just 31,090 units (See Annexe A to this Matter Statement). The gap in supply becomes greater still when assessed against NLP's objective assessment of housing need figure of 42,780 units.

1.6 In general terms, the Councils' assumptions are reliant on ambitious new settlement proposals all coming forward in the timescales envisaged - despite the uncertainties surrounding infrastructure delivery (as set out in Matter 5) - and with unrealistically high build out rates. Moreover, the strategy of the Councils lacks a 'Plan B' in the event that its assumptions (as CEG believes) prove not to be accurate, with no alternative sites capable of being released or brought forward. This means it does not satisfy the NPPF para 14 requirement for Plans to "*meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change*" (NLP emphasis).

1.7 Indeed, NLP's analysis based on more realistic assumptions identifies that the housing trajectory cannot identify a five year supply of housing across the HMA. Using the Council's own housing requirement figure, the HMA only has

4.29 years of supply; this worsens to 2.16 years when assessed against NLP's objective assessment of housing need figure. As such, both plans fail to comply with paragraph 47 of the NPPF which requires Councils' to '*identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer*'. As such, it will be necessary for both Councils to include more sites in the Plans and the housing trajectory to meet this shortfall.

2.0 **Matter 8B: Will the Plans ensure a rolling five year supply of specific deliverable sites in accordance with paragraph 47 of the Framework?**

iii. Does the Memorandum of Understanding (RD/Strat/350) reflect an acceptance that, individually, the two plans will not provide a rolling five year supply across the plan period? If so, will the planned MMs (Appendix 3 of the Councils' statement to Matter 1), which would rely on a combined housing trajectory for Greater Cambridge, ensure compliance with paragraph 47 of the Framework? Bearing in mind the Inspector's rejection of this approach in the Waterbeach appeals, are the Councils able to draw my attention to any cases where such an approach has been supported (other than where joint plans have been prepared)? Would it be a better approach, if supported by the evidence, to have a 'stepped approach' (see, for example, West Lancashire Local Plan) to identifying the five year housing land supply for each Council on an individual basis?

2.1 Yes. Both the Memorandum of Understanding and Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Councils' AMR 2014 show in their respective trajectories that South Cambridgeshire cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing between 2014/15 and 2018/19. Furthermore, in the latter stages of the trajectory Cambridge City cannot demonstrate a rolling five year land supply.

2.2 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF requires Councils to '*use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area*'. Given that the relevant housing market area is Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, the principle of a shared trajectory to demonstrate delivery and meet needs across the Cambridge HMA to meet needs that are, if anything, front loaded in the plan period is, on the face of it, reasonable and in accordance with paragraph 47. It reflects the fact that both local authorities would have been better served commencing this process by preparing a Joint Plan.

2.3 The late introduction of this Main Modification does, however, show that the Plans were not sound at the point of submission. It re-emphasises points that CEG made in respect of Matters 1, 2, and 6 that there has been a failure

across both Plans to cooperate effectively, prepare a compliant Sustainability Appraisal, or justify a sound strategy to meet housing needs across the Housing Market Area in line with the principle of sustainable development set out in the NPPF. None of those flaws are made good by virtue of a joint trajectory and approach to five year land supply.

- 2.4 Moreover, as identified above, using NLP's more robust analysis into the housing trajectories of both local authority areas, the MM does not address the problem that the trajectory (once amended to reflect more reasonable assumptions) is not sufficient to meet needs. As such, the plans would continue not to comply with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. To fulfil this requirement more sites will need to be added to the trajectory to allow for consistent supply, particularly in the first half of the plan period, and overall, to demonstrate a robust five year housing land supply position.
- 2.5 Whilst a 'stepped, alternative approach' could, in principle, work in specific circumstances (e.g. an area such as West Lancashire facing ongoing recession), it is inappropriate for Cambridge because it backloads delivery when there are opportunities, through site release (including in the Green Belt), to deliver sites up-front, in a strong housing market, to meet pressing needs. More significantly, it would fail to reflect the requirement of the NPPF, which is to boost significantly the supply of housing, and to meet the backlog of housing needs in the first five years.

iv. Does the evidence on past delivery, (which I have taken to be paragraphs 3.18 -3.19 of RD/Top/070 for CCC and Table 3 of RD/Top/050 for SCDC) justify the use of a 5%, rather than 20% buffer?

- 2.6 No. The NPPF sets out at paragraph 47 the circumstances under which a local authority can apply either the 5% or 20% buffer to their five year housing land supply calculation:
- "To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should: ... identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land".*
- 2.7 Cambridge City Council has failed to meet its planned supply of housing every year since 2001/02 (See the HETA 2014 update report Table 5.5 appended to CEG's Matter 3 Statement). The authority clearly has 'a record of persistent under delivery of housing' which in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF requires a 20% buffer to be added. The NPPF does not allow exceptions to be

made for economic downturn or the failure of certain strategic sites (as the City Council seeks to argue in paragraphs 3.18 - 3.19 of RD/Top/070) to come forward; in fact the use of the 20% buffer is precisely to allow for these type of uncertainties to be managed successfully with alternative sites, thereby “*positively seeking opportunities to meet the development needs of their area*” (para 14 of the NPPF).

- 2.8 South Cambridgeshire has also undersupplied against its planned housing targets in ten out of the fourteen years as set out in Table 3 of RD/Top/050. Furthermore, the Council has also undersupplied against its new Local Plan target of 950 in the first three years of the plan period. It is clear that the Council has ‘a record of persistent under delivery of housing’ which in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF requires a 20% buffer to be added. There is no justification for either Local Authority to be considered a 5% buffer authority based on the above evidence cited in question iv.

v. Is there compelling evidence with reference to historic delivery rates and expected future trends, as required by paragraph 48 of the Framework, that windfalls will contribute to the five year supply? For South Cambs Local Plan, are paragraphs 2.65 and 2.66 consistent with part 2 of Policy S/12?

Is there compelling evidence for windfalls?

- 2.9 NLP broadly agrees with the methodology utilised by the City Council in the calculation of its windfalls allowance. Cambridge City sets out its windfall calculation in the Cambridge City Topic Paper – Housing Land Supply (March 2014). The windfalls figure equates to 123 dwellings annually, this is calculated by averaging completions on windfall sites, excluding those on garden land, between March 2002 and March 2012, omitting the two highest and two lowest figures to allow for any potential anomalies in the data.
- 2.10 Although it is unlikely such opportunities will completely diminish in a strong housing market in a city with the urban form of Cambridge, windfalls sites are an ever decreasing form of supply as more and more are built out, which would justify a reduced rate going forward. However, as the City Council has already decreased the windfall supply on the basis of omitting peak years from the average, it is considered that its windfalls figure is broadly acceptable and based on compelling evidence.
- 2.11 The methodology utilised by South Cambridgeshire in quantifying its windfall allowance is much less compelling. South Cambridgeshire sets out its windfall calculation in the South Cambridgeshire Topic Paper – Housing Land Supply (March 2014). The windfalls figure has been calculated by averaging the windfall completions per year over the 6 years from 2006 to 2012 excluding gardens, this equates to 252 homes per year. Excluding one exceptional year

of unusually high completions in year 2007-2008 the average windfall completions per year over 5 years excluding gardens is 208 homes.

- 2.12 However, the Council has produced more historic data on windfall completions which would draw this conclusion into question. The average of the windfall completions including garden land between 1999 and 2005 equated to an average of 198 per annum, some ten units less than the windfall average adopted by South Cambridgeshire. If the permissions from garden sites were extrapolated from the earlier years, and windfalls were averaged over a longer period, this would equate to more compelling evidence for a windfalls figure. As the windfall completions between 1999 and 2005 is lower than the adopted windfalls figure prior to the exclusion of garden sites, it is likely this would place significant downward pressure on the realistic windfalls figure.

Consistency of paras 2.65-2.66 and Policy S/12

- 2.13 The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan approach in respect of the need for windfalls to achieve its five year land supply is not clearly expressed and thus on the face of it is inconsistent. Paragraphs 2.65 and 2.66 appear to suggest that it does not rely upon a five year land supply to meet a five year land supply but that windfalls are available if required to address any shortfall (incidentally, this is incorrect in that windfalls are not sufficient to bridge the gap in the first five years, hence the need for the joint Memorandum of Cooperation with Cambridge City). However, Part 2 of Policy Policy S/12 states “*The Council will provide a 5% buffer as part of its 5-year housing land supply, met mainly through windfalls*”.

vi. For each Council what, if any, is the shortfall in delivery from the early years of the Plan period which needs to be accounted for and can this be made up in the first five years, which is the preferred method in Planning Practice Guidance? If not, what are the local circumstances which justify using a longer period (i.e not the economic recession).

- 2.14 Cambridge City has no shortfall against the Council’s proposed housing requirement figure of 700 dwellings per annum between 2011/12 and 2013/14; in fact it has a marginal excess of 32 units. South Cambridgeshire, however, has undersupplied against the Council’s housing requirement of 950 dwellings per annum by 977 units. Table 3.5 of the attached Annex 1 sets out that incorporating this backlog and using a 20% buffer with NLP’s assessment of housing supply, the Cambridge HMA as a whole does **not** have a five year supply of housing land. There are no local circumstances that would justify extending the five year period: such an approach would not be compliant with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. More sites must be added to the trajectory to ensure a five year housing land supply can be maintained.

vii. How will the extra 1,000 new homes on rural exception sites to be delivered as part of the City Deal be reflected in the housing trajectory/ five year housing land supply?

- 2.15 South Cambridgeshire District Council has included a footnote in its November 2014 AMR's housing trajectory, which sets out that the trajectory does not include the 1,000 dwellings on rural exception sites proposed by City Deal funding. As the Council are uncertain about their delivery and have chosen to omit them from supply, and indeed have not included the consideration of these effectively in their Sustainability Appraisal, they cannot be included at this stage.
- 2.16 Furthermore, it is of note that how these new homes come forward may have impacts on double counting in the trajectory. For example, if these rural exception sites are to be delivered in small parcels, they may be double counted as windfall sites. Until such a time as the schemes proposed by the City Deal are known, it is not possible to know whether and if so how they can be incorporated into the trajectory and they must be excluded.
- 3.0 **Matter 8C: Should the more sustainable villages make an increased contribution to housing supply? Would this offer a more reliable contribution to land supply and delivery of new housing. (NB Specific policies for the rural areas – S/7, S/8, S/9, S/10, S/11 – will be considered in detail at a later hearing).**
- 3.1 No. This would be contrary to the development strategy set out by the Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan which sets out a hierarchy of development with priority to the existing urban area of Cambridge; then the defined fringe sites on the edge of Cambridge; then within the six small scale Green Belt sites proposed to be released from the inner Green Belt Boundary and finally within existing and newly identified new settlement locations (set out in Matter Statement 2 paragraph 1.2). Evidence presented by CEG in its representations and its Matters Statement on 2 and 7 shows that locations beyond the Green Belt are a less sustainable pattern of development, do not support sustainable travel modes, and, in terms of delivering housing to support the job growth potential of Cambridge, are much less effective as a much lower proportion of journeys to work from such locations are to Cambridge.

**ANNEXE A: HOUSING TRAJECTORY AND FIVE YEAR HOUSING LAND
SUPPLY – ANALYSIS PREPARED BY NLP ON BEHALF OF CEG**



**Nathaniel Lichfield
& Partners**

Planning. Design. Economics.

**Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire
Local Plan Examination**

**Housing Trajectory and Five Year
Housing Land Supply**

**Analysis prepared to support Matter
Statement 8**

Commercial Estates Group
16 January 2015

13577/MS

Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
14 Regent's Wharf
All Saints Street
London N1 9RL

nlppanning.com

This document is formatted for double sided printing.

© Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Ltd 2015. Trading as Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners.

All Rights Reserved.

Registered Office:

14 Regent's Wharf

All Saints Street

London N1 9RL

All plans within this document produced by NLP are based upon Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright reserved. Licence number AL50684A

Contents

1.0	Deliverability of Housing Sites	1
	Policy Context	1
	The Councils' evidence base	3
	Five Year Housing Land Supply	7
2.0	Realistic Trajectories for Housing Delivery	8
	Lead in times – Transport Infrastructure.....	8
	Build out rates	9
	Accordance with NPPF and PPG definition of developable sites (year 6 onwards)	9
	Use of gross rather than net completions on sites with planning permission ..	10
	Windfalls	10
	Conclusions	12
3.0	Conclusions on Deliverability and Trajectory	15
	Housing Trajectory over the entirety of the plan period	15
	Five Year Housing Land Supply	15
	Cambridge Five Year Housing Land Supply Position	18
	South Cambridgeshire Five Year Housing Land Supply Position	19
	Cambridge HMA Five Year Housing Land Supply Position	20

Appendices

Appendix 1 NLP Assessment – Site Specific Breakdown of Housing Trajectory

1.0 Deliverability of Housing Sites

- 1.1 This report considers the robustness of the housing trajectory proposed by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council over the plan period 2011 to 2031. It draws upon the housing trajectories produced by both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils in their 2013/14 Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs); the housing trajectory will be critically reviewed by NLP to ascertain whether there are any inaccuracies or overly optimistic assumptions within the trajectory. This report considers whether the housing trajectory for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council provides sufficient housing over the entire plan period 2011 to 2031, but also within the first five years between 2014/15 and 2018/19.

Policy Context

- 1.2 In reviewing the trajectories, it is necessary to have regard to relevant policy set out to guide Councils in their plan making. These are set out below.

Housing Trajectory

- 1.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) sets out the requirements placed on Local Planning Authorities to identify adequate opportunities for housing growth to meet their objectively assessed needs. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that to boost significantly the supply of housing, Local Authorities should:
- “use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period”.*
- 1.4 Beyond the initial five year period, the NPPF paragraph 47 requires that Local Planning Authorities should:
- “identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15”*
- 1.5 In determining a developable site or broad location, the PPG (ID 3-032-20140306) provides further guidance:
- “Developable sites or broad locations are areas that are in a suitable location for housing development and have a reasonable prospect that the site or broad location is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged. Local planning authorities will need to consider when in the plan period such sites or broad locations will come forward so that they can be identified on the development trajectory. These sites or broad locations may include large development opportunities such as urban extension or new settlements.”*

- 1.6 It is within the policy framework and guidance above that any supply beyond the first 5 years of the plan must be considered and we draw upon this throughout our analysis.

Five Year Housing Land Supply

- 1.7 With regards to a five year land supply, the NPPF sets out at paragraph 47 that local planning authorities should:

“Identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.”

- 1.8 The NPPF states in respect of what constitutes a ‘specific deliverable site’ that (footnote 11):

“To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans.”

- 1.9 The key tests for a site’s deliverability are therefore: that it is available now; that it offers a suitable location for development now; and that it is viable. Sites that are not available for development at the current point in time should not be considered deliverable.

- 1.10 The judgment of the Court of Appeal in *St Albans City and District Council v (1) Hunston Properties Limited and (2) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2013] EWCA Civ 1610 (hereafter referred to as "Hunston") goes to the heart of the interpretation of paragraph 47 of the NPPF in relation to housing needs and supply. Hunston establishes that paragraph 47 applies to decision-taking as well as plan-making and that where policies on a housing requirement are out of date (e.g. using a pre-NPPF basis, such as those contained within a Regional Strategy) or are absent then full objectively assessed needs become the relevant benchmark.

- 1.11 In this regard, and in the context of South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City forming a single (and very much integrated) Housing Market Area, the housing requirement figure proposed for each local authority cannot be afforded significant weight until it is adopted. In this context, the five year land supply may most appropriately be judged at HMA level.

The Councils' evidence base

- 1.12 Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council set out a joint housing trajectory in a Memorandum of Understanding dated September 2014. The document states that:
- “This Memorandum of Understanding confirms the agreement between the Council’s under the duty to co-operate that the housing trajectories for the two areas should be considered together, including for the purposes of calculating 5-year housing land supply”.*
- 1.13 This joint housing trajectory has subsequently been updated and published in both the Cambridge City Council AMR (December 2014) and South Cambridgeshire AMR (November 2014). This trajectory covers the plan period 2011 to 2031, including actual completions in the first three years which have already lapsed 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14. The housing trajectory as it appears in both AMR documents is set out below in Table 1.1.
- 1.14 The housing requirement set out in the Local Plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire totals 33,000 dwellings for the Cambridge HMA (Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire) over the period 2011 to 2031. Based on the Councils' joint housing trajectory they have a projected supply of 36,389 dwellings. This equates to an 'oversupply' over the plan period amounting to 3,389 dwellings.

Table 1.1 Housing Trajectory for Greater Cambridge 2011 to 2031 as it appears in Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire 2013/14 Annual Monitoring Reports

	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total
Cambridge Urban Area																					
Cambridge existing allocations				121	112	169	178	142	194	109	40	91	69	62	40	55	0	0	0	0	1,382
Cambridge new allocations				0	10	15	25	45	0	55	86	107	150	190	173	132	110	115	132	123	1,468
South Cambridgeshire existing allocations				65	75	85	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260
South Cambridgeshire new allocations				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fringe Sites																					
Cambridge existing allocations				402	819	1,330	1,009	860	773	521	490	203	40	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	6,481
Cambridge new allocations				0	0	0	137	167	146	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
South Cambridgeshire existing allocations				29	20	230	315	445	550	495	460	540	380	290	165	140	95	0	0	0	4,154
South Cambridgeshire new allocations				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Cambridgeshire New Settlements																					
New settlements existing allocations				0	10	216	264	305	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	5,595
New settlements new allocations				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100	220	220	320	420	520	620	620	3,100
South Cambridgeshire																					
Existing allocations in rural area				255	264	334	310	204	110	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,492
New allocations in rural area				0	57	192	265	290	245	200	210	250	160	150	100	0	0	0	0	0	2,119
Unallocated sites with planning permission																					
Cambridge				89	71	144	0	11	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329
South Cambridgeshire				355	373	251	76	34	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,094
Windfall Allowance																					
Cambridge windfall allowance				0	0	123	123	123	123	123	123	123	123	123	123	124	124	124	124	124	1,850
South Cambridgeshire windfall allowance				0	0	0	100	150	150	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	2,600
Actual Completions																					
Cambridge	352	481	1,299	612	1,012	1,781	1,472	1,348	1,236	832	739	524	382	375	370	311	234	239	256	247	14,102
South Cambridgeshire	678	559	636	704	799	1,308	1,365	1,428	1,460	1,310	1,270	1,450	1,240	1,260	1,085	1,060	1,115	1,120	1,220	1,220	22,287
Total	1,030	1,040	1,935	1,316	1,811	3,089	2,837	2,776	2,696	2,142	2,009	1,974	1,622	1,635	1,455	1,371	1,349	1,359	1,476	1,467	36,389

Source: Cambridge City Council Annual Monitoring Report (December 2014) and South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report (November 2014)

Five Year Housing Land Supply

- 1.15 The Cambridge City Council AMR (December 2014) sets out the City's five year housing land supply position at Figure 4, with the South Cambridgeshire AMR (November 2014) setting out its own five year housing land supply position and that of Greater Cambridge at Figure 4.12 (City and South Cambridgeshire).
- 1.16 Both the Councils assess their five year housing land supply position using both the 'Liverpool' and 'Sedgefield' methods for calculating the delivery of backlog. However, it is established in the PPG that '*Local planning authorities should aim to deal with any undersupply within the first 5 years of the plan period where possible*' (ID 3-035-20140306), i.e. the Sedgefield Method.
- 1.17 As such, the summary of what the Councils deem to be their respective five year housing land supply positions is set out below in Table 1.2, excluding the calculation using the 'Liverpool' Method. The Councils' amalgamated position of what they consider to be their five year housing land supply position is also set out below.

Table 1.2 Five year housing land supply position statement 2014/15 to 2018/19

	Cambridge City	South Cambridgeshire	Greater Cambridge (City & South Cambs)
a) Housing provision required in Local Plan 2011 - 2031	14,000	19,000	33,000
b) Requirement up to 31 March 2014 (based on annualised average requirement)	2,100	2,850	4,950
c) Dwellings completed up to 31 March 2014	2,132	1,873	4,005
d) Shortfall against annualised average requirement	+32	-977	945
e) Five year supply requirement	3,468	5,727	9,195
f) With 5% buffer	3,641	6,013	9,655
g) With 20% buffer	4162	6,872	11,034
h) Number of dwellings predicted to be completed	6,225	5,604	11,829
Five year supply (=h/e x5)	9.0	4.9	6.4
Five year supply (with 5%) (=h/f x5)	8.5	4.7	6.1
Five year supply (with 5%) (=h/g x5)	7.5	4.1	5.4

Source: Cambridge City Council Annual Monitoring Report (December 2014) and South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report (November 2014)

2.0 **Realistic Trajectories for Housing Delivery**

2.1 There are a number of components of supply in both the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire housing trajectories to 2018/19 which NLP considers to be unrealistic or simply incorrect. In particular, NLP has significant concerns relating to the delivery of some of the new settlements/strategic sites, the delivery of some sites beyond 2018/19 which would not appear to comply with the NPPF and PPG definition of developable; and the incorrect inclusion of data for sites with planning permission. These concerns are broadly set out below. Appendix 1 includes an individual site-by-site breakdown in the form of an alternative trajectory.

Lead in times – Transport Infrastructure

2.2 The Matters Statement produced by Bryan G Hall on behalf of Commercial Estates Group to Matter 5 of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination set out at paragraphs 2.6 to 2.12 that the respective Local Plans have not set out housing completion trigger points for infrastructure delivery ‘tipping points’. This is important in the context of the housing trajectory. For example, on the basis of the analysis by Bryan G Hall in Appendix 4 of CEG’s Matter Statement 5, the tipping point for housing completions at Cambourne West will be reached (200 units) prior to the delivery of critical transport and access infrastructure based on the Council’s housing trajectory. The tipping point for Cambourne West is considered to be 200 dwellings before the following infrastructure is required to be delivered:

- A1303 inbound bus priority, A428 to M11 in Cambourne West, Cambourne and Bourn Airfield;
- A1303 Madingley Road inbound bus priority, M11 to Queens Road in Cambourne and Bourn Airfield;
- 1000 space Park & Ride site, Bourn Airfield/Cambourne area; and
- Busway/bus priority links from the A428/A1198 Caxton Gibbet junction through West Cambourne, Cambourne and Bourn Airfield, linking to the A1303 at its junction with the A4283.

2.3 On the basis of the analysis the above four projects will not be completed until 2021/22. As such, projected delivery as set out in the housing trajectory by the Council has been moved back three years. In Cambourne West this does not reduce the delivery of housing over the plan period, but reduces the quantity of dwellings coming forward between 2014/15 to 2018/19 from 200 to 0 as the start date should be moved back.

2.4 With regards to Waterbeach, if the principle of the site’s development is accepted, then the start date (2026/27) for completions appears reasonable due to the lengthy lead in times of sites of this scale, albeit there are ongoing uncertainties surrounding the funding and delivery of necessary infrastructure,

and there is no basis to conclude it could be brought forward to bridge gaps earlier in the supply.in South Cambridgeshire.

Build out rates

- 2.5 The HETA 2013 report¹ sets out at paragraphs 6.44 to 6.52 analysis on past delivery rates of Strategic Scale Developments/New Settlements including Cambourne, The Wixams, Elvetham Heath, Ebbsfleet Valley and Red Lodge. Ultimately it is concluded that there does not appear to be any evidence that build-rates substantially in excess of 250 dwellings per annum would be achievable within any single site or location within the Local Plan period, including where there are multiple developers on site (Cambourne had three and did not exceed this average).
- 2.6 This is important as the South Cambridgeshire Housing Trajectory (set out in the 2014 AMR) assumes build-out rates of up to 400 in Northstowe Phase 2 and Waterbeach New Town. These rates of delivery are overly optimistic and a more reasonable and realistic rate of delivery would be to assume the output of these schemes at 250 dwellings per annum.
- 2.7 In the context of the housing trajectory, this pushes the projected completions of these sites beyond 2031 in Northstowe Phase 1 and 2. This reduces delivery in the plan period by 1,859 units from 5,595 to 3,726. Delivery in the plan period in Waterbeach New Town is reduced from 1,400 to 1,050. Combined this reduces projected completions over the plan period by 2,219 units. Equally, Cambourne West and Bourne Airfield are in close proximity to one another, both south of the A428, in effect forming a single broad location of development. Given this proximity it is considered that their joint build rates could not reasonably be assumed to exceed 250 dwellings per annum. By recognising this limit, the quantity of housing delivered on the Cambourne West site is that the build period increases from 10 years to 11 years. For Bourne Airfield the delivery within the plan period reduces by 520 units from 1,700 to 1,180.

Accordance with NPPF and PPG definition of developable sites (year 6 onwards)

- 2.8 NPPF Footnote 12 at paragraph 47 states the following with regards to the requirements of a developable site, one coming forward after the first five years:

“To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.” NLP emphasis

¹ See the CEG Housing and Employment Technical Assessment (submitted with CEG’s original representations) https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/draft_submission/reps/28102%204%20NLP%20Housing%20and%20Employment%20Technical%20Assessment.pdf

2.9 There are a number of instances in the housing trajectory where it is not considered that suitable evidence has been produced regarding the availability or viability of a site, particularly with regards to where an existing use would need to relocate, to fulfil the criteria of the site having a ‘reasonable prospect’ of being developable. The comments section of the site by site assessments in Appendix 1 of this report sets out where this has been applicable in a site being removed from the trajectory.

Use of gross rather than net completions on sites with planning permission

2.10 There are numerous instances, set out below, in both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire where the Councils have included gross projected housing completions on a site with planning permission, as opposed to the net figure where demolition of dwellings is required. Using the gross figure is incorrect and overinflates the quantity of supply coming forward from these sites. In total this equates to a decrease in the trajectory of 193 units.

Table 2.1 Sites where Councils have included gross as opposed to net completions

	Site	Council projected completions	NLP amended projected completions	Difference
Cambridge City	Willowcroft, Histon Road	78	77	-1
	Roman Courts East and West	16	-12	-28
	18-19 Regent Terrace	11	8	-3
	51 Barnwell Road	21	-3	-24
	Latimer Close	16	0	-16
	189 Histon Road	12	10	-2
	6-14 Water Lane	24	0	-24
South Cambridgeshire	Land to the rear of 231-247 Milton Road	13	12	-1
	S/2013/11: Windmill Estate, Fulbourn	21	0	-21
	S/2285/10: Green Street, Willingham	2	1	-1
	S/0820/12, S/0879/14 & S/0047/14: MacFarlane	30	-2	-32
	S/2064/12: Robson Court, Waterbeach	30	-5	-35
	S/2420/12: Cambridge Road, Linton	18	14	-4
S/2230/12 & S/2664/13: Cinques Road, Gamlingay	9	8	-1	
Total		301	108	-193

Source: NLP analysis and online planning application records from Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

Windfalls

2.11 Paragraph 48 of the NPPF sets out the following with regards to the inclusion of windfalls in a housing trajectory :

“Local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five-

year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the SHLAA, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens.”

Cambridge

- 2.12 NLP broadly agrees with the methodology utilised by Cambridge City in the calculation of its windfalls allowance. Cambridge City sets out its windfall calculation in the Cambridge City Topic Paper – Housing Land Supply (March 2014). The windfalls figure equates to 123 dwellings annually, this is calculated by averaging completions on windfall sites, excluding those on garden land, between March 2002 and March 2012, omitting the two highest and two lowest figures to allow for any potential anomalies in the data.
- 2.13 Although it is unlikely such opportunities will completely diminish in a strong housing market, windfalls sites are an ever decreasing form of supply as more and more are built out, which would justify a reduced rate going forward. However, as Cambridge have already decreased the windfall supply on the basis of omitting peak years from the average, it is considered that their windfalls figure is broadly acceptable and based on compelling evidence.

South Cambridgeshire

- 2.14 The methodology utilised by South Cambridgeshire in quantifying their windfall allowance is much less compelling. South Cambridgeshire set out their windfall calculation in the South Cambridgeshire Topic Paper – Housing Land Supply (March 2014). The windfalls figure has been calculated by averaging the windfall completions per year over the six years from 2006 to 2012 excluding gardens; this equates to 252 homes per year. Excluding one exceptional year of unusually high completions in year 2007-2008 the average windfall completions per year over five years excluding gardens falls to 208 homes.
- 2.15 However, the Council has produced more historic data on windfall completions which would call this conclusion into question.

Table 2.2 Windfall Housing Completions Since 1999 in South Cambridgeshire

Time Period	Windfalls
1999-2001	396 G*
2001-2002	186 G
2002-2003	222 G
2003-2004	190 G
2004-2005	194 G
2005-2006	Not known
2006-2007	170
2007-2008	471
2008-2009	170
2009-2010	265
2010-2011	217
2011-2012	220

Source: South Cambridgeshire Topic Paper – Housing Land Supply (March 2014)

*G includes garden land

2.16 The average of the windfall completions including garden land between 1999 and 2005 equate to an average of 198 per annum, some ten units less than the windfall average adopted by South Cambridgeshire. If the permissions from garden sites were excluded from the earlier years, and windfalls were averaged over a longer period, this would equate to a more robust and realistic windfalls figure. As the windfall completions between 1999 and 2005 are lower than the adopted windfalls figure prior to the exclusion of garden sites, as such the overall average figure would be lower. .

2.17 However, as NLP has not had access to any further evidence on historic windfall completions than is set out above, the windfalls figure for South Cambridgeshire has not been altered in the analysis and is likely to be an overestimate.

Conclusions

2.18 Based on the above analysis and full summary set out in Appendix 1, the total housing supply in the Cambridge HMA over the plan period amounts to 31,090, below the 33,000 homes currently proposed in the Local Plans.

Table 2.0.1 NLP assessment of the Housing Trajectory for Greater Cambridge 2011 to 203

	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total
Cambridge Urban Area																					
Cambridge existing allocations				121	112	161	179	143	172	29	30	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,000
Cambridge new allocations				0	10	15	25	45	0	0	0	40	75	30	10	10	0	0	0	0	260
South Cambridgeshire existing allocations				65	35	35	5	0	50	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
South Cambridgeshire new allocations				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fringe Sites																					
Cambridge existing allocations				401	641	658	806	836	815	750	645	293	250	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	6,129
Cambridge new allocations				0	0	0	137	167	146	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
South Cambridgeshire existing allocations				29	20	70	355	290	380	550	440	540	380	290	290	290	120	0	0	0	4,044
South Cambridgeshire new allocations				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Cambridgeshire New Settlements																					
New settlements existing allocations				0	10	216	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	3,726
New settlements new allocations				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100	125	125	225	325	400	400	470	2,230
South Cambridgeshire																					
Existing allocations in rural area				255	264	303	210	154	90	115	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,491
New allocations in rural area				0	25	100	119	130	105	160	170	200	150	150	150	150	150	100	0	0	1,859
Unallocated sites with planning permission																					
Cambridge				17	47	142	0	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
South Cambridgeshire				261	373	248	76	34	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	997
Windfall Allowance																					
Cambridge windfall allowance				0	0	123	123	123	123	123	123	123	124	122	123	124	124	124	124	124	1,850
South Cambridgeshire windfall allowance				0	0	0	100	150	150	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	2,600
Actual Completions																					
Cambridge	352	481	1,299	539	810	1,099	1,270	1,325	1,256	914	798	509	449	152	167	134	124	124	124	124	12,050
South Cambridgeshire	678	559	636	610	727	972	1,115	1,008	1,030	1,305	1,110	1,300	1,080	990	990	1,090	1,020	950	950	920	19,040
Total	1,030	1,040	1,935	1,149	1,537	2,071	2,385	2,333	2,286	2,219	1,908	1,809	1,529	1,142	1,157	1,224	1,144	1,074	1,074	1,044	31,090
Total Five Year Land Supply					9,475																

Source: NLP analysis, Cambridge City Council Annual Monitoring Report (December 2014) and South Cambridgeshire Annual Monitoring Report (November 2014)

3.0 **Conclusions on Deliverability and Trajectory**

Housing Trajectory over the entirety of the plan period

3.1 Based on NLP's analysis of the components of supply in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire housing trajectory, it is considered that a more realistic and robust quantity of supply over the plan period for the Cambridge HMA equates to 31,090 units². This is a reduction of 5,299 units from the Councils' position of 36,389 units between 2011 and 2031.

3.2 Measured against the Councils' own target of 33,000 dwellings over the plan period 2011 to 2031, this amounts to a shortfall of 1,910 units, with no allowance for flexibility. However, as set out in the HETA 2014 update report³, NLP's own objective assessment of housing need calculation identifies a need for 42,780 dwellings over the plan period or 2,139 dwellings per annum. Against this housing requirement, the housing supply in the Cambridge HMA amounts to a shortfall of some 11,690 dwellings.

Five Year Housing Land Supply

3.3 In addition to the analysis of land supply undertaken in the preceding section, to ascertain the five year housing land supply position of the Cambridge HMA it is also necessary to ascertain the appropriate housing requirement against which to measure it.

Annual Requirement

3.4 NLP has independently undertaken an objective assessment of housing need study for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire which is set out earlier in the HETA Update report 2014 at Section B. NLP conclude that the objective assessment of housing need for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire is **2,139 dwellings** per annum over the period 2011 to 2031. If it were split (on a modelled basis) between the two local authorities this equates to **798 dwellings** per annum for Cambridge City and **1,341 dwellings** per annum in South Cambridgeshire District over the plan period to 2031. It should be noted that this split is in many respects artificial because the split of the housing requirement between the two authorities should be a matter of policy, taking account of the Sustainability Appraisal and review of the Green Belt. In this regard, the requirement figures for the individual LPAs is wholly indicative, and up until the housing requirement for each local authority area has been identified and found sound the most appropriate geography for the assessment is at HMA level.

² Even then, this is likely an overestimate as it includes a windfall allowance for South Cambridgeshire which has not been robustly substantiated.

³ Appended to CEG's Matter 3 Statement

Backlog (Past undersupply)

- 3.5 As set out in Section B of the HETA update report, NLP advocate a stepped trajectory which, overall, averages delivery at 2,139 dwellings per annum over the 20 year period between 2011 and 2031 but front loads delivery. Although our objective assessment of housing need figure implicitly includes backlog of housing need, as required by the PPG, this must be met in the first five years of the plan period. As such the first five years of the plan period should have a target which is commensurately greater than the remaining 15 years to take account of the backlog of housing need as well as the need to support the immediate economic potential of the area with a front-loading of job creation across the period apparent (see Part A of the HETA update report).
- 3.6 On this basis, NLP has measured the two authorities' historic backlog of housing need in Section B of the HETA update report, Table 5.5, against the relevant housing requirement. Total backlog to 2010/11 (immediately prior to the start of the plan period) amounts to 5,671 in Cambridge and 5,600 in South Cambridgeshire.
- 3.7 Table 3.1 below demonstrates how NLP's objective assessment of housing need figure has been stepped to take account of this backlog to deliver it in the first five years of the plan period.

Table 3.1 Stepped approach to delivering NLP's objective assessment of housing need figure whilst including backlog in the first five years of the plan period

Backlog (dwellings)	OAHN first five years	(per annum)	OAHN remaining 15 years	(per annum)	Total 20 year period
Cambridge					
5,671	8,243.25	1,648.65	7,716.75	514.45	15,960
South Cambridgeshire					
5,600	10,905	2,181	15,915	1,061	26,820
Cambridge HMA					
11271	19148.25	3829.65	23631.75	1575.45	42,780

Source: NLP analysis

- 3.8 On top of this undersupply from 2011 onwards must be included, as an additional component, backlog in the five year housing land supply calculation. Table 3.2 below sets out this backlog.

Table 3.2 Completions against NLP's objectively assessed housing needs figure 2011/12 to 2013/14

Year	Completions	NLP Objective Assessment of Need calculation (2011 to 2031)	
		Target	Surplus/ shortfall
Cambridge			
2011/12	352	1,649	-1,297
2012/13	481	1,649	-1,168
2013/14	1,299	1,649	-350
Total	2,132	4,947	-2,815
South Cambridgeshire			
2011/12	678	2,181	-1,503
2012/13	559	2,181	-1,622
2013/14	636	2,181	-1,545
Total	1,873	6,543	-4,670
Cambridge HMA			
2011/12	1,030	3,830	-2,800
2012/13	1,040	3,830	-2,790
2013/14	1,935	3,830	-1,895
Total	4,005	11,490	-7,485

Source: NLP analysis

Buffer

3.9

The PPG (ID 3-035-20140306) states that “*the assessment of a local delivery record is likely to be more robust if a longer term view is taken, since this is likely to take account of the peaks and troughs of the housing market cycle*”. Based on the past completions analysis set out in Section B of the HETA update report in Table 5.5, it is clear that neither Cambridge City nor South Cambridgeshire have met their housing requirement in any year between 2001/02 and 2010/11. Furthermore, in 2011/12 and 2012/13 both failed to meet their proposed Local Plan targets. NLP consider this amounts to persistent undersupply and as such a 20% buffer is required.

Cambridge Five Year Housing Land Supply Position

Table 3.3 Scenario Outcomes

	Component	Approach 1 Council 5% buffer	Approach 2 Council 20% buffer	Approach 3 Council 20% with NLP amended supply	Approach 4 NLP assessment
a.	Annual Requirement (with 2001/02 to 2010/11 backlog 'front loaded' for Approach 4)	700	700	700	(1,649x2) + (514x3)
b.	Five-year requirement	3,500	3,500	3,500	4,840
c.	Backlog/Undersupply (2011/12 to 2013/14)	32	32	32	-2,815
d.	Five-year requirement including undersupply	3,500	3,500	3,500	7,655
e.	Five-year requirement + buffer (5% or 20%)	3,675	4,200	4,200	9,186
f.	Total Supply 2014/15 to 2018/19	6,225	6,225	5,043	5,043
g.	Total surplus/deficit	2,550	2,025	843	-4,143
h.	Five-year housing land supply	8.47	7.41	6.00	2.74

Source: NLP analysis

- 3.10 Table 3.3 provides a summary comparison of Cambridge's stated five year land supply position using a 5% and 20% buffer in Approach 1 and 2. Approach 3 and 4 incorporate NLP's land supply assessment and Approach 4 includes NLP's land supply assessment and NLP's objective assessment of housing need (subject to the caveats set out in paragraph 3.4 above).
- 3.11 Cambridge City Council has indicated that it has 8.47 years of housing land supply. However, as it stands, it is considered that the Council's approach is deficient and overly optimistic in several areas, when comparing the assumptions made in the Council's assessment against the definitions and requirements of the NPPF. Simply by applying the 20% buffer (Approach 2) the five year land supply position drops to 7.41 years.
- 3.12 NLP's assessment of Cambridge's five-year housing land supply position, following the principles established in Hunston⁴, as well as following the principles of dealing with backlog as set out in the PPG, has identified a five year requirement of 9,186 units against which Cambridge only has sites identified equivalent to a deficit of 4,143 units or 2.74 years of supply (Approach 4).

⁴ St Albans City and District Council v (1) Hunston Properties Limited and (2) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2013] EWCA Civ 1610

South Cambridgeshire Five Year Housing Land Supply Position

Table 3.4 Scenario Outcomes

	Component	Approach 1 Council 5% buffer	Approach 2 Council 20% buffer	Approach 3 Council 20% with NLP amended supply	Approach 4 NLP assessment
a.	Annual Requirement (with 2001/02 to 2010/11 backlog 'front loaded' for Approach 4)	950	950	950	(2,181x2) + (1,061x3)
b.	Five-year requirement	4,750	4,750	4,750	7,545
c.	Backlog/Undersupply (2011/12 to 2013/14)	-977	-977	-977	-4,670
d.	Five-year requirement including undersupply	5,727	5,727	5,727	12,215
e.	Five-year requirement + buffer (5% or 20%)	6,013	6,872	6,872	14,658
f.	Total Supply 2014/15 to 2018/19	5,604	5,604	4,432	4,432
g.	Total surplus/deficit	-409	-1,268	-2,440	-10,226
h.	Five-year housing land supply	4.66	4.08	3.22	1.51

Source: NLP analysis

- 3.13 Table 3.4 provides a summary comparison of South Cambridge's stated five year land supply position using a 5% and 20% buffer in Approach 1 and 2. Approach 3 and 4 incorporate NLP's land supply assessment and Approach 4 includes NLP's land supply assessment and NLP's objective assessment of housing need.
- 3.14 South Cambridgeshire District Council contends that its only has 4.66 years of housing land supply. However, as it stands, it is considered that the Council's approach is deficient and overly optimistic in several areas, when comparing the assumptions made in the Council's assessment against the definitions and requirements of the NPPF. Simply by applying the 20% buffer (Approach 2) the five year land supply position drops to 4.08 years.
- 3.15 By incorporating NLP's more realistic five year housing land supply total, as set out in section 2.0 above, South Cambridgeshire can only demonstrate 3.22 years of supply, amounting to a deficit of 2,440 units (Approach 3).
- 3.16 NLP's assessment of South Cambridgeshire's five-year housing land supply position, following the principles established in Hunston and the PPG, has identified a five year requirement of 14,658 units against which South Cambridgeshire only has sites identified equivalent to a deficit of circa 10,226 units or 1.51 years of supply (Approach 4).

Cambridge HMA Five Year Housing Land Supply Position

Table 3.5 Scenario outcomes

	Component	Approach 1 Council 5% buffer	Approach 2 Council 20% buffer	Approach 3 Council 20% with NLP amended supply	Approach 4 NLP assessment
a.	Annual Requirement (with 2001/02 to 2010/11 backlog 'front loaded' for Approach 4)	1,650	1,650	1,650	(3,830x2) + (1,575x3)
b.	Five-year requirement	8,250	8,250	8,250	10,810
c.	Backlog/Undersupply (2011/12 to 2013/14)	945	945	945	7,485
d.	Five-year requirement including undersupply	9,195	9,195	9,195	18,295
e.	Five-year requirement + buffer (5% or 20%)	9,655	11,034	11,034	21,954
f.	Total Supply 2014/15 to 2018/19	11,829	11,829	9,475	9,475
g.	Total surplus/deficit	2,174	795	-1,559	-12,479
h.	Five-year housing land supply (as at 31/3/14)	6.13	5.36	4.29	2.16

Source: NLP Analysis

- 3.17 Table 3.5 provides a summary comparison of the Cambridge HMA's stated five year land supply position using a 5% and 20% buffer in Approach 1 and 2. Approach 3 and 4 incorporate NLP's land supply assessment and Approach 4 includes NLP's object and NLP's objective assessment of housing need.
- 3.18 Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire contend that, combined, they have 6.13 years of housing land supply. However, it is considered that the Councils' aggregate approach is deficient and overly optimistic in several areas, when comparing the assumptions made in the Councils' assessment against the definitions and requirements of the NPPF. Simply by applying the 20% buffer (Approach 2) the five year land supply position drops to 5.36 years.
- 3.19 By incorporating NLP's more realistic five year housing land supply total, as set out in section 2.0 of this report, the HMA can only demonstrate 4.29 years of housing land supply, amounting to a deficit of 1,559 units (Approach 3).
- 3.20 NLP's assessment of the Cambridge HMA's five-year housing land supply position, following the principles established in Hunston, as well as following the principles of dealing with backlog set out in the PPG, has identified a five year requirement of 21,954 units against which the HMA only has sites identified equivalent to a deficit of 12,479 units or 2.16 years of supply (Approach 4).

Appendix 1 NLP Assessment – Site Specific Breakdown of Housing Trajectory

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
Cambridge																				
Urban Extensions																				
Cambridge East	CCC	0	0	10	115	102	90	66	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408	As noted by The SHLAA 2013, the land proposed for development is outside the ownership of the major landowner within the AAP boundary and a developer is being sought for these plots. Furthermore, the Land North of Cherry Hinton was identified within the AAP (Section C1) as being deliverable in association with other development plots, whereas now it is being considered as an individual plot. Without a developer in place and in the knowledge that the adjoining plots would not come forward in the plan period there can be no reasonable prospect of deliverable development on this site,
	NLP	0	0	0	0	40	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	The Coldham's Lane site has consent for 57 dwellings which have been left in the trajectory (14/0028/OUT). Although the 2014 AMR states that it would take at least 4 years for first completions, as such delivery has been moved back one year to account for this.
NIAB	CCC	0	100	200	250	250	250	250	250	43	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	1,627	No objections.
	NLP	0	100	200	250	250	250	250	250	43	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	1,627	
Clay Farm	CCC	251	427	492	363	232	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,895	The site has total capacity for 2,176 units with 281 already built at 2013/14. Reserved Matters applications for 1,928 units have already been approved, it is not unreasonable to assume all remaining units will come forward in the plan period. Albeit, some of the annual build rates are very high at 400/500. Maximum annual build rate has been reduced to 250 p.a.
	NLP	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,895	
NW University	CCC	0	0	520	225	230	255	205	215	160	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,850	No objection to the planning status of the site, but delivery as high as stated in the AMR trajectory has not been evidenced by the Council other than a statement from the developer. This is very much out of sink with NLP's own evidence and annual build rates have been reduced to no more than 250.
	NLP	0	0	100	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,850	
Trumpington Meadows	CCC	79	126	63	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316	No objections.
	NLP	79	126	63	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316	
Glebe Farm	CCC	72	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	Permission 09/1140/FUL is for 286 units (confirmed on application from and decision notice), 172 units have been completed at 2013/14, so 114 are remaining, Council's projected completions totalled 115 so one unit has been taken out.
	NLP	72	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	
Bell School	CCC	0	123	45	56	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	270	No objections.
	NLP	0	123	45	56	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	270	
Local Plan Allocations																				

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
CUP Site Clarendon Road	CCC	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	No objections.
	NLP	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	
The Paddocks Trading Estate, Cherry Hinton Road	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	This site was allocated as a proposals site for residential development as part of the 2006 Local Plan (Site 5.02) – The Paddocks Trading estate. It is now allocated as Site R7 in the Local Plan 2014 and promoted for residential development. There are currently no applications for the redevelopment of this site. The Sites Assessment Proforma identifies the sites key constraint to be accessibility given its proximity from the town centre, amenity space and services, but considers it may still be viable. ⁵ However, The Paddocks Trading Estate (Site R7 - 123 dwellings), is currently used as an existing employment area, with existing business occupiers. The relocation of these existing business premises faces restrictions in terms of lease arrangements and also there is a lack of evidence that there are suitable (and available) sites for the businesses relocation. As such the site does not comply with the developability definition in footnote 12 of the NPPF which requires that <i>'there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.'</i>
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
British Telecom, Cromwell Road	CCC	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	No objections.
	NLP	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	
379-381 Milton Road	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	55	0	0	0	0	95	The viability of this site, in the context of the NPPF's developability definition in footnote 12, is questionable. The viability of this site is set out in SHLAA means the site may not be achievable. Equally the current use is on a long lease so availability over the plan period is unknown. Due to both these uncertainties, it is considered the site fails to meet the developability criteria set out in the NPPF.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cambridge City Football Ground,	CCC	0	0	0	50	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	50	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	
British Telecom, Long Road	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	26	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	26	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	
Willowcroft,	CCC	0	0	17	50	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	Application 14/1254/FUL includes demolishing one dwelling (15-1=14), as such one

⁵ Local Plan sites proforma for Paddocks Trading Estate <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/lando2/Assessment%20Form%20Site%20R7%20-%20The%20Paddocks,%20Cherry%20Hinton%20Road%E2%80%A6.pdf>

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
Histon Road	NLP	0	0	14	51	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	dwelling has been removed from the net total to account for this, the remaining dwellings add up to SHLAA total and are not disputed.
Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road	CCC	0	0	15	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	15	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	
Police Station, Parkside	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	Site is allocated as Site M4 in the Local Plan 2014. There are no planning applications associated with the redevelopment of the site for residential. There is no other relevant planning history on the police station site itself. However the site is currently still in use with no evidence produced to indicate that the use could be relocated elsewhere. Based on the above, it is not considered that the site is available to warrant the projected allocation to come forward during the plan period and therefore does not satisfy the reasonable prospect of the site being developable as required by footnote 12 of the NPPF. It has therefore been removed.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Milton Infant & Junior School, Milton	CCC	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	All 5 dwellings have been removed. The Council have refused the planning application 14/0052/FUL which included 5 dwellings and a 131 unit aparthotel, community space and five dwellings. The application is subject to an appeal, but until the outcome of this appeal is finalised this application should be omitted from the trajectory as its status is uncertain, and as it stands unsuitable in the eyes of the Council.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ridgeons, Cavendish Road	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	
Housing allocation at, Henry Giles House, Chesterton Road, Cambridge,	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	The site is allocated as Site R4 in the Local Plan 2014. There is no relevant planning history, however it appears the site is still currently being used by Job Centre. There is no evidence to suggest this employment use could or will be located elsewhere. Also, no evidence has been produced which indicates that the landowner is pursuing development. Based on the above, this site has been removed from the trajectory because it cannot satisfy the reasonable prospect of the site being developable as required by footnote 12 of the NPPF. .
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
295 Histon Road	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	The site is currently in use, it is leased to a squash club. There is a lack of evidence that there are suitable (and available) sites for the relocation of these existing premises. As such the site does not comply with the developability definition in footnote 12 of the NPPF which requires that 'there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged'.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sandy Lane	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	Questionable viability of the site means it may not be achievable. The site has a history of lapsed applications and 03/0406/FUL has awaited nearly 7 years for a S106 to be agreed and 09/1024/EXP is yet to be decided 5 years after validation. As the site cannot be considered achievable based on the requirements of the NPPF, it has been removed
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
																				from the trajectory.
30-31 Occupation Road	CCC	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	No objections.
	NLP	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	
71-73 New Street	CCC	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	No objections.
	NLP	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	
9-15 Harvest Way	CCC	0	0	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	
Betjeman House, Hills Road	CCC	0	0	0	50	50	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	50	50	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	
Land Around 16 Mill Lane	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	
Magnet Warehouse, Mill Road	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	The capacity of the site has been reduced to 25 in accordance with the SHLAA figure, there is no evidence as to where 30 comes from.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
Station Area - Blue Phase	CCC	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	No objections.
	NLP	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	
Station Area - Pink Phase	CCC	0	80	57	0	25	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252	No objections.
	NLP	0	80	57	0	25	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252	
Large sites over 50																				
Cambridge Water Company, Rustat Road	CCC	0	35	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	No objections.
	NLP	0	35	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	
Small Sites 10-49																				
141 Ditton Walk	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	Application 11/0596/FUL for 14 units expired on the 16/12/14, the 2014 AMR identified no material start has been made on site. Application 13/0804/FUL for 2 units remains live, and as such the trajectory is reduced to 2.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
115-119	CCC	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	Application still live 12/0730/FUL, no objection.

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
Perne Road	NLP	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
169-173 High Street, East Chesterton	CCC	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	Application still live 12/0086/FUL, no objection.
	NLP	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Roman Courts (East and West)	CCC	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	Applications live on this site 12/0932/FUL (converting 15 into 8) 12/0931/FUL (converting 14 into 9) equate to a net housing figure of -12, as such the trajectory figure for this site is altered from the gross figure used by the Council.
	NLP	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-12	
18-19 Regent Terrace	CCC	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	Application live 11/1375/FUL (includes demolition of 3 dwellings, net = 8). Trajectory is reduced to the net figure of 8 as opposed to the Council's gross figure of 11.
	NLP	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
51 Barnwell Road	CCC	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	Application live 13/0776/FUL. Existing 24 dwellings demolished to make way for 21 new, net =-3. Trajectory is reduced to the net figure of -3 as opposed to the Council's gross figure of 21.
	NLP	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-3	
1 Ditton Walk	CCC	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Latimer Close	CCC	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	Application live 12/1598/FUL, demolishing 20 units and building 20, the net gain is 0. The trajectory has been updated accordingly.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
189 Histon Road	CCC	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	Application 13/0231/FUL includes demolition of 2 dwellings, net = 10. The trajectory is updated to use the net figure of 10 as opposed to the Council's gross figure of 12.
	NLP	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
6-14 Water Lane	CCC	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	Application 13/1386/FUL demolishes 24 units and builds 24, net = 0. The trajectory is updated to use the net figure of 0 as opposed to the Council's gross figure of 24.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Land to the Rear of 231-247 Milton Road	CCC	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	Application 12/1537/FUL demolishes one dwelling and builds 13, net = 12. The trajectory is updated to use the net figure of 12 as opposed to the Council's gross figure of 13.
	NLP	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
55-57 Regent Street	CCC	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	No objections.
	NLP	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
87 East Road	CCC	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	

Additional Allocations

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments	
Land north of Wort's Causeway	CCC	0	0	0	60	80	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	60	80	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Land south of Wort's Causeway	CCC	0	0	0	77	77	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	230	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	77	77	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Camfields Resource Centre and Oil Depot	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	The site is currently in use as a fuel depot. There is a lack of evidence that there are suitable (and available) sites for the relocation of these existing premises. As such the site does not comply with the developability definition in footnote 12 of the NPPF which requires that 'there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged'
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
149 Cherry Hinton Road and Telephone Exchange, Coleridge Road	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	13	33	The site is currently in use as business premises. There is a lack of evidence that there are suitable (and available) sites for the relocation of these existing premises. As such the site does not comply with the developability definition in footnote 12 of the NPPF which requires that 'there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged'	
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
Mill Road Depot and adjoining properties,	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	35	35	32	30	167	The site is currently used as a Council depot and proposed for residential use. Work is being conducted to relocate the depot however this is on-going. Any development on the site is subject to the relocation of the Council depot. ⁷ It is understood the Council has previously explored relocation options for this depot with no success. Based on the above, it is not considered that the site is available to warrant the projected allocation to come forward during the plan period and therefore does not satisfy the reasonable prospect of the site being developable as required by footnote 12 of the NPPF. The projection has therefore been removed.	
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
Horizon Resource Centre, 285 Coldham's Lane	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	40	The site is allocated in the Local Plan 2014 for 40 dwellings (Site R11). It is currently used as a day centre but has been put forward by the landowner. ⁸ There are no significant constraints at the site, for residential use however there is no evidence in the Local Plan that the loss of this employment use could be located elsewhere. There are no current planning permissions at the site and based on the loss of employment envisaged through use as a resource centre, the allocation has been removed.	
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0

⁷ Site R10 Technical Assessment <http://cambridge.jdi-consult.net/localplan/readdoc.php?docid=167&chapter=4&docelemid=d32188#d32188>

⁸ Site R11 Technical Assessment <http://cambridge.jdi-consult.net/localplan/readdoc.php?docid=167&chapter=4&docelemid=d32188#d32188>

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
British Telecom, Long Road	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	The site is allocated for 76 dwellings however the landowner is only looking to release part of the site for residential development the projected housing delivery is reflective of this. Any additional releases would be subject to phasing. There are no current planning applications at the site. British Telecom, Long Road (Site R14 - 76 dwellings) which has elements of the existing use which would need to be retained, with extensive underground cabling may render parts of the site unsuitable/unviable for development. It has therefore been removed from the trajectory.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Foster Road	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	20	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	The site is currently in use. There is a lack of evidence that there are suitable (and available) sites for the relocation of these existing premises. As such the site does not comply with the developability definition in footnote 12 of the NPPF which requires that 'there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged'
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mount Pleasant House, Mount Pleasant	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	Reduced to zero because it is stated in the Council 2014 AMR that new landowners wish to develop it for student housing.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Clifton Road Area	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	60	70	70	60	60	60	60	60	550	Historically the site was a protected industrial estate. Part of the site is a sorting office. The rest of site - Landowner put forward as mixed use (employment + residential) in call for additional sites. The Housing Capacity Assessment however states that the need to displace and relocate the existing employment coupled with the above constraints means there is no certainty that the figure could be achieved within the plan period and in agreement with this we have removed the projection. ¹⁰ This is similarly reiterated in the Cambridge Housing Assessment Report 2013 p.5.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Michael Young Centre, Purbeck Road	CCC	0	10	15	25	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	No objections.
	NLP	0	10	15	25	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	

¹⁰ Capacity Assessment Full Report (2013), p.9

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
82-88 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman St	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	20	The site is allocated as M5 in the Local Plan 2014. Some potential for mixed use including residential on part. No potential on 57-60 Bateman Street as 100+ year lease. Some potential for mixed use including residential on remainder. On-going discussions regarding current leases. ¹¹ According to the planning history the original use of the site was residential. There is no evidence to suggest that over the plan period 20 dwellings could not come forward.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	20	
636-656 Newmarket Road, Holy Cross Church Hall, East Barnwell Community	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	20	20	20	75	The site is currently in use.. There is a lack of evidence that there are suitable (and available) sites for the relocation of these existing premises. As such the site does not comply with the developability definition in footnote 12 of the NPPF which requires that 'there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged'
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ridgeons, Cromwell Road	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	50	50	50	27	0	0	0	0	217	The site is identified for having capacity for 120 houses within the technical assessment ¹² There are no current applications at the site but it has been put forward by the landowner and therefore the estimation made is beyond that which has been assessed and is therefore considered speculative. There is no reason why this site could not be developed over the plan period. However we have changed the figure to reflect the housing capacity as identified on the site.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	50	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	
315-349 Mill Road and Brookfields	CCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	50	23	0	0	0	0	0	98	The site is allocated for 98 houses (Site R21). The technical assessment states the site has capacity for 25 dwellings. Furthermore the site has been subject to the following planning consents: 11/1100/FUL / Change of use of established car showroom/sales (Use Class sui generis) to car valeting (Use Class B1) and hand car wash (sui generis) mixed use and siting of portacabin for staff facilities/shelter, together with removal of internal fence and tidying up of site. The technical assessment refers to planning permissions 11/1348/FUL and 07/0644/FUL associated with the sites however these are associated with properties 309-311. Furthermore, it states that capacity for the site is 25. It is therefore not considered that these projections are accurate and therefore the trajectory figure has been reduced to 25 dwellings over the plan period.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
Glebe Farm 2	CCC	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	Application 14/1792/FUL for 30 dwellings on this site is pending consideration. The Council's Housing Capacity Assessment (September 2013) states: Site 1: Approval granted for the development of 286 dwellings. Construction underway and first homes were occupied in September 2012. As such, given the history of housing delivery on the site There is no reason however why 30 units could not come forward in the timeframe
	NLP	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	

¹¹ Site M5 Technical Assessment <http://cambridge.jdi-consult.net/localplan/readdoc.php?docid=167&chapter=7&docelemid=d32207#d32207>

¹² Site R12 Technical Assessment <http://cambridge.jdi-consult.net/localplan/readdoc.php?docid=167&chapter=4&docelemid=d32190#d32190>

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
																				indicated in the AMR. This density tally's with the density analysis in the HETA 2013 report submitted by CEG.
Windfall - North Cambridge	CCC	0	0	30	31	30	31	31	31	30	31	30	31	31	31	31	31	31	461	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	30	31	30	31	31	31	30	31	30	31	31	31	31	31	31	461	
Windfall - East Cambridge	CCC	0	0	31	31	31	31	31	30	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	464	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	31	31	31	31	31	30	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	464	
Windfall - South Cambridge	CCC	0	0	31	31	31	31	30	31	31	31	30	31	31	31	31	31	31	463	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	31	31	31	31	30	31	31	31	30	31	31	31	31	31	31	463	
Windfall - West Cambridge	CCC	0	0	31	30	31	30	31	31	31	31	31	30	31	31	31	31	31	462	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	31	30	31	30	31	31	31	31	31	30	31	31	31	31	31	462	
Total Cambridge	NLP	539	810	1,099	1,270	1,325	1,256	914	798	509	449	152	167	134	124	124	124	124	12,050	(including completions in years 2011/12 to 2013/14)
	CCC	822	1,195	2,094	1,650	1,501	1,430	955	779	615	451	437	410	366	234	239	256	247	14,102	

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	-------	----------

South Cambridgeshire

Adopted allocations without planning permission: Edge of Cambridge

Cambridge East - north of Newmarket Road	SCDC	0	0	0	0	85	140	140	140	140	140	140	140	140	95	0	0	0	1,300	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	85	140	140	140	140	140	140	140	140	95	0	0	0	1,300	
Cambridge East - north of cherry hinton	SCDC	0	0	0	20	30	20	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	The land at Cherry Hinton can only commence in part before the Airport is non-operational. According to the Cambridge Eats AAP this initial development was due to commence within the previous plan period however did not materialise. There is no plan to develop on or near the airport until after 2031 and there is no application relating to the 140 units proposed in this plan period. As such, given the uncertainty of the majority of this area and the lack of progress in the plan period, without expressed commitment from the developer we believe this element of the allocation should be removed from the plan period.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Land between Huntingdon Road, Histon Road & A14 (NIAB 2 or Darwin Green 2)	SCDC	0	0	0	0	75	150	150	150	150	150	150	25	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	The site, as noted by the AMR, is entirely dependent on the A14 improvement works. As these are not expected to complete until 2019/20, it is unreasonable to consider that completions will start before this date. As such the projections have been moved forward with delivery commencing in 2020/21. However, this has no impact on the overall delivery within the plan period
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	150	150	150	150	150	25	0	0	0	0	1,000	
Orchard Park - parcel K1	SCDC	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	The outline permission at Orchard Park has lapsed without parcel K1 having gained detailed consent. There is no known current application despite the Council stating in the AMR one was expected in Autumn 2014. Therefore the 36 units should be removed from the delivery trajectory.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Orchard Park - additional land parcels (L2 & Com4)	SCDC	0	0	50	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	The Site Specific Policies DPD (January 2010) anticipates this site can deliver 80 units. However the landowner has submitted an application (S/1760/14) for 147 units. Due to the disagreement between the Council and landowner on the quantity of dwellings the site can deliver, the projected deliver has been pushed beyond the five year period to allow time for a suitable scheme for both parties to be agreed.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	50	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	

Adopted allocations without planning permission: New Settlements

Northstowe phase 2 and later phases	SCDC	0	0	0	0	50	92	232	232	289	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	4,095	Based on the length of time taken for the Phase 1 planning period at the Northstowe site, the lead in time is considered reasonable. Build rates have been reduced in line with NLP's evidence to not exceed 250 per annum.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	50	50	76	100	100	150	200	250	250	250	250	250	250	2,226	

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments	
Adopted allocations without planning permission: Village sites																					
Fulbourn & Ida Darwin Hospitals	SCDC	0	0	30	100	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	230	This site should not be included in the first five years, as both sites appear to be in use (NHS website) as such not they do not meet the tests of the NPPF which requires sites in the first five years of projected delivery to be available <u>now</u> .
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	30	100	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	230	
Papworth Everard West Central - south of Church Lane	SCDC	0	8	28	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	No objections.
	NLP	0	8	28	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	
Papworth Everard West Central - Catholic Church site	SCDC	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Application S/2196/13 for two dwellings has been reused due to lack of contributions, this draws into question the viability of the scheme and therefore its achievability. As there is no evidence the scheme is achievable it has been removed from the trajectory.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Existing Planning Permissions (at 31 March 2013)																					
Trumpington Meadows (Cambridge Southern Fringe)	SCDC	29	0	160	100	150	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	589	Phase 1 has of this scheme has consent for 29 units, and are under construction. However, it took three years from the Reserved Matters consent to building. As such the remainder of the development is pushed back a year, even if the remaining Reserved Matters are submitted immediately, and assuming some site conditions have been cleared through phase 1, it is considered that delivery will not come forward realistically before 2 years after consent.
	NLP	29	0	0	160	100	150	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	589	
North-West Cambridge (University site)	SCDC	0	20	70	195	105	90	185	150	250	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,155	Outline Permission was granted on 22 February 2013 for development of up to 3,000 dwellings at the University Site. A letter confirming that all pre-commencement conditions have been discharged was issued to the applicant in July 2014 and reserved matters applications have also been approved. The AMR states that the developer envisages the first dwellings to be completed in 2015-16 (AMR paragraph A.23) there is no evidence that this cannot be achieved.
	NLP	0	20	70	195	105	90	185	150	250	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,155	
Orchard Park - addition land parcels (Q, former HRCC site & Com2) including local centre	SCDC	65	35	35	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	No objections.
	NLP	65	35	35	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	
Northstowe Phase 1	SCDC	0	10	216	264	255	308	168	168	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	Build rates have been reduced in line with NLP's evidence to not exceed 250 per annum.
	NLP	0	10	216	250	200	200	174	150	150	100	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	
Cambourne (additional)	SCDC	175	175	175	120	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	739	No objections.
	NLP	175	175	175	120	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	739	

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
950 dwellings)																				
Former Bayer Cropscience site	SCDC	0	30	60	60	60	60	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	285	No objections.
	NLP	0	30	60	60	60	60	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	285	
Historic Rural Allocations with planning permission																				
West of Ermine Street South, Papworth Everard	SCDC	80	51	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	No objections.
	NLP	80	51	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	
Windfall Sites: Estate sized (9 or more dwellings)																				
S/1029/10: Land at Moores Farm, Foxton	SCDC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
S/2013/11: Windmill Estate, Fulbourn	SCDC	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	The application relates to the erection of 79 dwellings (47 market and 32 affordable), following demolition of 34 existing dwellings, and associated parking and landscaping. This equates to a net housing figure of 45. The 21 units included in the trajectory for this site have been omitted as double counting, with the remainder of the completions obviously included in previous year.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
S/0261/09 & S/1886/14: West Road, Gamlingay	SCDC	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	No objections.
	NLP	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
S/2285/10: Green Street, Willingham	SCDC	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	The trajectory does not net off the demolished dwelling, 7 already completed (of 9) as such the trajectory is reduced to 1. .
	NLP	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
S/1778/10: Gretton Court, Girton	SCDC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
S/0133/11: The Railway Tavern, Great Shelford	SCDC	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	No objections.
	NLP	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
S/1463/10: Nelson Crescent & High Street,	SCDC	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	No objections.
	NLP	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
S/0733/11: Brickhills, Willingham	SCDC	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	No objections.
	NLP	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	
S/1771/08 & S/1948/12: Station Road, Gamlingay	SCDC	24	24	24	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	No objections.
	NLP	24	24	24	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	
S/2509/12: Long Drove & Beech Road, Cottenham	SCDC	26	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	No objections.
	NLP	26	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	
S/0809/12: SCA Packaging, Histon	SCDC	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	No objections.
	NLP	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
S/2609/11 & S/1798/10: The Moor, Melbourn	SCDC	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
S/0983/11 & S/1388/12: Former EDF Energy Depot	SCDC	51	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	No objections.
	NLP	51	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	
S/0820/12, S/0879/14 & S/0047/14: MacFarlane	SCDC	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	Application S/0820/12 identifies 32 existing units which are proposed to be refurbished to 28 flats and 2 new bungalows. As such the net housing figure is -2, this is included in the trajectory as opposed to the Council's gross figure.
	NLP	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	
S/2064/12: Robson Court, Waterbeach	SCDC	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	Application S/2064/12 gives consent for the demolition of existing 35 no. shared amenity apartments for the homeless and the erection of 30 no. self-contained apartments for the homeless with associated parking and amenity space. The net figure is -5 and this is included in the trajectory instead of the Council's gross projection.
	NLP	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-5	
S/1783/12 & S/1786/12: Former John Falkner	SCDC	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	No objections.
	NLP	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
S/1044/11: Church Street, Great	SCDC	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	No objections.
	NLP	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
Eversden																				
S/1725/12, S/1727/12, S/1728/12, S/1023/14 & S/0990/14:	SCDC	0	25	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	No objections.
	NLP	0	25	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	
S/2420/12: Cambridge Road, Linton	SCDC	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	Application S/2420/12 granted consent for the erection of 18 affordable dwellings following demolition of 4no. existing dwellings, former Police Station and outbuildings; formation of replacement vehicular access. The net figure of 14 is used in the trajectory rather than the Council's gross figure of 18.
	NLP	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	
S/2230/12 & S/2664/13: Cinques Road, Gamlingay	SCDC	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	Application S/2230/12 is for the delivery of 9 dwellings, but with the demolition of 1 bungalow. The net figure is 8 and this is included in the trajectory instead of the Council's gross figure of 9.
	NLP	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Windfall Sites: Small Sites (8 or less dwellings) already Under Construction	SCDC	91	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	Not possible to analyse these sites further, no information on individual sites.
	NLP	91	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	
Windfall Sites: Small Sites (8 or less dwellings) Not Under Construction	SCDC	20	50	71	40	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201	Not possible to analyse these sites further, no information on individual sites.
	NLP	20	50	71	40	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201	
Planning applications for 9 or more dwellings where decision to grant planning permission either awaiting the signing of a s106 agreement or resolution of outstanding issues (as at 31 March 2014)																				
S/2290/10: Woodside, Longstanton	SCDC	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	No objections.
	NLP	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
New Local Plan Allocations: Strategic Sites																				
Land between Huntingdon Road, Histon Road & A14 (NIAB 3 or Darwin Green 3)	SCDC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments	
Northstowe Reserve	SCDC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Waterbeach New Town	SCDC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	200	300	400	400	1,400	Build rates have been reduced in line with NLP's evidence to not exceed 250 per annum.	
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	200	250	250	250	1,050		
Bourn Airfield New Village	SCDC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	1,700	Cambourne West and Bourne Airfield are in close proximity to one another, both south of the A428. Given this proximity it is considered that their joint build rates should not exceed 250 dwellings per annum.	
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100	125	125	125	125	150	150	220	1,180		
Cambourne West	SCDC	0	0	30	70	100	150	150	150	150	150	150	100	0	0	0	0	0	1,200	The lead in time for this site has been amended as per the comments from the transport consultants regarding the tipping point of delivery prior to necessary road infrastructure being in place. Cambourne West and Bourne Airfield are in close proximity to one another, both south of the A428. Given this proximity it is considered that their joint build rates should not exceed 250 dwellings per annum.	
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	30	70	100	150	150	125	125	125	125	100	100	0	1,200		
New Local Plan Allocations: Village Sites																					
Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston	SCDC	0	0	10	50	50	20	0	10	50	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	There is online evidence that the site is currently on the market for sale. There is no suggestion that it has been sold or is currently under offer and/or whether a developer would be interested in purchasing the site for residential development. According to the Council's AMR the site is allocated for residential with an element of employment (policy H1/a) and is considered to have a limited development potential (this judgement does not take account of the suitability of residential at the site in policy terms). It states there is capacity for about 200 houses.	
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston	SCDC	0	0	0	20	40	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	An EIA screening application was submitted and approved in 2013 for the relocation of the football stadium at the site. There have been no further applications and therefore we do not consider that new housing will come forward at the site in the next five years. Significantly, planning permission for a residential scheme was refused on the site (S/1505/04/O) as inappropriate development in the Green Belt and a decision at appeal confirmed this (as no special circumstances were demonstrated). The site has not been marketed nor has there been developer interest.	
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	20	40	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80		
It has therefore been removed from the Five Year trajectory due to site constraints and uncertainties but could come forward over the plan period.																					

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston	SCDC	0	0	0	0	55	55	50	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	55	55	50	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260	
Land north of Impington Lane, Impington	SCDC	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	Even if the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan is adopted, at the earliest this would not be until the end 2015. It would not be viable to submit an application until this location has been tested as an allocation through the Local Plan process, particularly given past refusals on site. Starting on site in early 2016 is therefore unrealistic and delivery is pushed back a year.
	NLP	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
Land west of New Road, Melbourn	SCDC	0	10	30	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	An application for 64 units is currently being considered on this site (S/2048/14). As such the trajectory has been reduced down from 65 to take account of the application.
	NLP	0	10	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	
Green End Industrial Estate, Gamlingay	SCDC	0	0	30	30	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	30	30	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	
Land at Bennell Farm, West Street, Comberton	SCDC	0	15	30	30	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	No objections.
	NLP	0	15	30	30	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	
East of Rockmill End, Willingham	SCDC	0	10	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	Even if the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan is adopted, at the earliest this would not be until the end 2015. It would not be viable to submit an application until this location has been tested as an allocation through the Local Plan process, particularly given past refusals on site. Starting on site in early 2016 is therefore unrealistic and delivery is pushed back a year.
	NLP	0	0	10	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	
New Local Plan Allocations: Parish Council Proposals																				
Land at Linton Road, Great Abington	SCDC	0	10	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	The Council recommended that this and the following three Great Abington Sites at Linton Road, junction at Manor Farm, High Street, Papworth Road and Land at Bancroft Farm were unsuitable for housing development through previous SHLAA documents due to significant site constraints. The Neighbourhood Plan group did not concur and have allocated it for residential development within their framework. It is not considered that the circumstances of these sites have changed since they were last assessed. On this basis, these have been removed from the trajectory given the uncertainty surrounding them. ¹³
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

¹³ 2013 AMR paragraph A.73

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments	
Land at junction of High Street & Pampisford Road, Great Abington	SCDC	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	It is set out in the SHLAA (2013) that this site is not suitable – 'The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints'. It also has planning refusals for housing - An inspector considered an appeal over a refusal to allow a series of single dwellings south of 110 High Street. He considered that any development beyond the existing houses along this road would permanently diminish the existing prospect of open countryside from High Street. It would represent a visual intrusion into the countryside and would seriously harm the open and rural character of the area. Based on the above it is not considered that this site is suitable based on the Council's own evidence and as such is removed from the trajectory.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington	SCDC	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	The SHLAA (2013) states that this site is unsuitable – 'The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints'. The site also has a history of refused applications - 'He (an Inspector) considered that the trees along the road frontage make a considerable contribution to the rural aspect of Church Lane.... 'The construction of vehicular crossings and the formation of driveways would intrude into this vista and detract from the character which this part of Church Lane has at present.'(S/0433/85/O). Based on the above it is not considered that this site is suitable based on the Council's own evidence and as such is removed from the trajectory.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Land at Toseland Road, Graveley	SCDC	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	No evidence has been produced to ascertain the suitability, availability or achievability of this site. There are no proposals for the site or developer interest and therefore it is not included in the trajectory.
	NLP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Windfall Sites																					
Windfall Sites	SCDC	0	0	0	100	150	150	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	2,600	No objection.
	NLP	0	0	0	100	150	150	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	2,600	
Planning Permissions Granted between 1 April and 31 August 2014																					
S/0645/13: Cody Road, Waterbeach	SCDC	0	30	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	No objections.
	NLP	0	30	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	
S/1359/13: Bannold Road, Waterbeach	SCDC	0	45	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	No objections.
	NLP	0	45	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	
S/2607/12:	SCDC	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	No objections.

Site Details	NLP/ Council trajectory	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Comments
Showman's Site, Meldreth	NLP	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
S/2379/13: Hurdleditch Road, Orwell	SCDC	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	No objections.
	NLP	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	
S/0641/13: Granta Processors, Whittlesford	SCDC	0	0	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	No objections.
	NLP	0	0	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	
Windfall Sites: Small Sites (8 or less dwellings)	SCDC	0	5	15	20	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	No objections.
	NLP	0	5	15	20	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	
Planning applications for 9 or more dwellings where decision to grant planning permission either awaiting the signing of a s106 agreement or resolution of outstanding issues (between 1 April and 31 August 2014)																				
S/2312/13: Fen Drayton Road, Swavesey	SCDC	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	No objections.
	NLP	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	
S/1329/13: Rear of Cygnus Business Park,	SCDC	0	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	The application form states that 9 dwellings will be built. Prior to the production of the decision notice the total number of dwellings in the trajectory has been reduced to 9 from 12.
	NLP	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
S/1199/13: The Causeway, Bassingbourn-cum	SCDC	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	No objections.
	NLP	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	

Total Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire	Total South Cambridgeshire		Site Details
	NLP	SCDC	NLP/ Council trajectory
1,149	610	704	2014/15
1,537	727	799	2015/16
2,071	972	1,308	2016/17
2,385	1,115	1,365	2017/18
2,333	1,008	1,428	2018/19
2,286	1,030	1,460	2019/20
2,219	1,305	1,310	2020/21
1,908	1,110	1,270	2021/22
1,809	1,300	1,450	2022/23
1,529	1,080	1,240	2023/24
1,142	990	1,260	2024/25
1,157	990	1,085	2025/26
1,224	1,090	1,060	2026/27
1,144	1,020	1,115	2027/28
1,074	950	1,120	2028/29
1,074	950	1,220	2029/30
1,044	920	1,220	2030/31
31,090 (including completions in years 2011/12 to 2013/14)	19,040 (including completions in years 2011/12 to 2013/14)	22,287 (including completions in years 2011/12 to 2013/14)	Total
			Comments

