

Local Plan Examinations
Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire

Matters and Issues for Joint hearing sessions relating to Proposed Modifications

Matter PM1 – Housing

Issues:

PM1A Objectively assessed housing need (OAHN)

Modification PM/CC/2/B and supporting modifications
Modification PM/SC/2/H and supporting modifications

PM1A.1

Does the further work on objectively assessed housing need (OAHN), carried out by Peter Brett Associates (PBA) for the Councils (RD/MC/040) ensure that the methodology used is now generally compliant with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). NB Following their letter to the Councils of 29th March 2016 the Inspectors expect this to have been addressed through the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground, which will form the basis for the discussion of any areas of disagreement at the hearings.

PM1A.2

Bearing in mind that PPG notes that no single approach will provide a definitive answer, do the OAHN figures of 14,000 new dwellings for Cambridge City and 19,500 new dwellings for South Cambridgeshire provide a robust basis to underpin the provision on new housing in the Local Plans. If not, why not and why are alternative figures to be preferred?

PM1A.3

The OAHN figures are also the housing requirement figures in both plans. What is the relationship between these figures and the 1,000 extra homes which are part of the City Deal.

PM1B 5 year housing land supply and joint trajectory

Modification PM/CC/2/C and supporting modifications
Modification PM/SC/2/B and supporting modifications

PM1B.1

The Framework (paragraph 47) states, amongst other things, 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. Planning Policy Guidance Ref 010 2a-010-20140306 advises: *Where there is a joint plan, housing requirements and the need to identify a five year supply of sites can apply across the joint plan area. The approach being taken should be set out clearly in the plan.*

Are there any local circumstances which justify the use of a joint trajectory without a joint plan? If so what are they?

PM1B.2

Will the use of a joint trajectory assist in meeting the objectives of the Framework, including the delivery of sustainable development and boosting, significantly, the supply of land for housing?

PM1B.3

Is it clear how this approach would work in practice; i.e how would the five year land supply would be calculated and updated; and it is clear how any failure to provide a five year supply would be resolved?

**Local Plan Examinations
Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

PM1B.4

The Memorandum of Understanding (RD/Strat/350) indicated that, as part of the City Deal arrangements, the Councils have agreed to prepare a joint Local Plan and Transport Strategy starting in 2019. Should this commitment be expressly included in the Local Plans?

Matter PM2 - Green Belt Review methodology

Modification PM/CC/2/E and supporting modifications

Modification PM/SC/2/C and supporting modifications

Issues:

PM2.1

Does the Cambridge Inner Green Belt Study (November 2015) (RD/MC/030) use a methodology which enables a clear and transparent assessment of how the existing Cambridge Green Belt performs against the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, with particular reference to:

- a. Baseline studies and analysis
- b. The identification of areas for assessment (the sectors and sub sectors)
- c. Identification of qualities/assessment criteria – are all 16 clearly related to Green Belt purposes?

Inspectors' Note: We do not intend to consider site specific issues in this hearing. These can be more appropriately dealt with when specific allocations or omission sites are considered. Nor do we intend, in this hearing, to discuss sustainability issues arising from paragraph 84 of the Framework.