

**Chapter 7: Delivering High Quality Homes**

The audit trail for **Policy H/1: Allocations for Residential Development at Villages** that resulted from the following issues is included in Chapter 3 (Strategic Sites):

**Issues and Options 2012 Issue 16**

**Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1) Chapter 9 including Questions 2 and 3**

**Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2) Issue 1**

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 45</b>	<b>Housing Density</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Monitoring Reports</li> <li>• DETR Planning Research Programme - The Use of Density in Planning 1998</li> </ul>
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD Policy HG/1 The following AAP policies will remain in place: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge East AAP Policy CE/7</li> <li>• Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP Policy CSF/7</li> <li>• North West Cambridge AAP Policy NW/5</li> <li>• Northstowe AAP Policy NS/7</li> </ul>
Analysis	<p>The existing plans making up the LDF contain a number of density policies. Those contained in Area Action Plans for the major developments would remain in place and would not be superseded by a new density policy in the Local Plan which would only replace policy HG/1. Policy HG/1 seeks average net densities of at least 30dph unless local circumstances require a different approach, and average net densities of at least 40dph should be achieved in more sustainable locations. The AAP generally seek to achieve average net densities of 50dph, with the exceptions of Cambridge East which sets a minimum of 50dph and seeks to achieve 75dph and the Northstowe AAP which seeks to achieve an average net density of 40dph.</p> <p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to set their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances. At paragraph 58 it also requires planning policies to ensure that amongst other considerations, developments optimise the potential of sites to accommodate development.</p> <p>The 1998 DETR research paper ‘The use of Density in Planning’ demonstrates that the area required to accommodate 400 dwellings decreases rapidly as density increases up to 30 dph. As density increases above 30 dph the area required decreases more slowly, with little change above 90 dph. In parallel with this the research identifies that the land required to provide social and community facilities falls rapidly as density increases up to 20 dph, beyond which the land requirement remains fairly constant, regardless of density. This indicates that subject to local circumstances it is most sustainable to develop at densities of 30 dph or more.</p>

Monitoring shows that in new developments completed between 1999 and 2011 the overall average net density of completed developments in South Cambridgeshire on sites of 9 or more dwellings rose from 27.6 dph in 1999 – 2001, to 36.1 dph in 2010-2011. The density of historical development in six villages has been assessed by looking at typical street blocks developed in three different time periods. Two villages have been selected from our Rural Centres, two from our Minor rural Centres and two from our Group Villages. The first time period is for developments prior to 1914, when no planning controls on development were in force. The second time period is 1914 to 2000, when planning controls were in force, but prior to the imposition of the minimum density requirement in PPG3. The third time period is 2000 from onwards when the minimum density requirement of 30 dph was in force until 2011. The assessment of net residential densities in sample villages, indicates that during the period 1914 to 2000 residential densities overall were significantly lower at circa 21.2 dph, than the pre 1914 level of circa 38.4 dph. Post 2000 residential density levels rose to circa 41.8 dph slightly above the pre-1914 levels. The figures also indicate that the pre 1914 residential densities decrease from villages in the rural centres category, to the minor rural centres category and further to the group villages' category.

Ten completed development sites have been examined to assess the quality of developments, with particular reference to residential density and car parking. All assessed schemes are at densities greater than 30 dph, as the Council's current policy requirement is for a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare, unless there are exceptional local circumstances; with the categories assessed being between 30 and 39 dph, between 40 and 49 dph, between 50 and 59 dph and between 80 and 89 dph. Sites were selected in a variety of locations, the two growth areas of Orchard Park and Cambourne, the fringe of Cambridge and in South Cambridgeshire villages. The findings suggest that at densities of between 30 to 39 dph developers have developed house types and an approach to site and block layout that enables quality development to be produced, whilst at densities of greater than 80 dph developers are required to design specifically for the scheme resulting in good quality development. The greatest issues were seen at densities above 40 dph where developers sought to maintain the use of standard house types.

The use of average net densities allows for a wide variation in density across a site; and especially on very large sites, this range of densities could extend from below 30 dph to above 100 dph. The proposed Cambridge Fringe density of 40 dph is in response to the distance of the sites in the District from the city centre, because they adjoin existing low density suburbs and in some cases because of their sensitive locations.

	<p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives</b></p> <p>Three alternative options have been identified. Not to include a density policy and rely on other Local Plan policies and the NPPF to protect amenity and ensure the efficient use of land. To include a policy setting an 30 dph minimum across the District, and to provide density standards depending on position in the settlement hierarchy.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 45:</b> Which of the following options do you agree with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Provide no specific guidance on density</li> <li>ii. Include a policy with a density target of an average of 30 dph on a development but allowing for variation from site to site to reflect local circumstance</li> <li>iii. Include a policy with higher average target densities in the most sustainable locations and lower average densities in the least sustainable but allowing for variation from site to site to reflect local circumstances.</li> </ul>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>All three options seek efficient use of land, therefore contributing to achievement of the land objective, although there is a higher degree of uncertainty associated with providing no specific guidance (option i), as it would not establish a minimum. By using land efficiency, the option could contribute to the landscape and townscape objective. Given the requirements to deliver good design, proposed in other options, it cannot be assumed that higher densities would have a negative impact on the creating good spaces objective. All options appear to offer flexibility to reflect local townscape character.</p> <p>Alongside this density needs to be balanced with climate change mitigation, and the delivery of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although with good design and dual use of spaces both should be achievable. Seeking higher densities in accessible locations (option iii) would contribute to focusing development where sustainable travel can be achieved, and support access to employment.</p>
Representations Received	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Support: 10, Object: 3, Comment: 4</li> <li>ii. Support: 21, Object: 3, Comment: 4</li> <li>iii. Support: 38, Object: 4, Comment: 1</li> </ul> <p>Please provide any comments: 26</p>

Key Issues from Representations

**Question 45 i**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Restrict guidance only to large sites and via a Design Guide. Inflexible guidance on small sites can lead to locally unacceptable developments.
- The market should determine site densities
- Each site should be considered on merit taking into account local views
- Rely on NPPF, 1 Parish Council

**OBJECTIONS:**

- Density guidance provides clarity for planning applications
- Developers must be given guidance

**COMMENTS:**

- Densities to be design led
- Site density policies should take local circumstances and scheme viability into account

**Question 45 ii**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support from 7 Parish Councils.
- 30 dph offers the best balance of affordable to Market housing for ensuring a sustainable and viable community
- Clear density guidance must be given as a basis for applications for new developments, but flexibility is required so that site specific variation, needs and constraints can be accommodated
- Allows for lower densities on village edges and other sensitive locations

**OBJECTIONS:**

- Housing density should be lower than Cambourne
- 30 dph is the wrong density for our villages

**Question 45 iii**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support from 8 Parish Councils, flexibility and ability to take local context into account are important.
- Agree set targets based on sustainability and respecting context inappropriate development can erode the quality of place and identity in settlements and the countryside
- High density housing need not affect quality, to fit the maximum number of homes on the available land the targets should be high
- Too low a density will reduce the ability of the development to accept affordable housing, s106 and CIL contributions.

	<p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limiting choice to either 30 dph and 40dph is too restrictive and would add to oversupply of medium density housing compared with the undersupply of low density properties</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council objects that 40 dph may be too low for sites on the edge of Cambridge as the City target is 45 dph</li> <li>• There will be a demand for low density development in sustainable locations, which needs to be facilitated by the Local Plan</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy with higher average densities in the most sustainable locations (edge of Cambridge and new settlements at 40 dph), and lower average densities (30 dph), in less sustainable locations (Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centres and Group Villages), but allowing for variation from site to site to reflect local circumstances. Note that the SHLAA 2012 and the site capacities included in the site options for I&amp;O1 in Summer 2012 had assumed 40dph for Rural Centres but after consideration of representations and on further reflection of the existing density characteristics of Rural Centres it was concluded that the policy should include an average density of 30dph in Rural Centres. This has had the effect of reducing the assumed site capacities of potential site allocations in the Local Plan. The policy will not apply to infill villages where a design-led approach will be followed taking account of the character of the area in which it is located.</p> <p>There was strong support for inclusion of a policy although some objectors thought that this could be left to the market, or dealt with on a site by site basis. However land is a finite resource and must be used efficiently if sustainable development is to be achieved and clear policy guidelines are a well understood and practical way to achieve this. The preferred policy approach provides clear guidance combined with the flexibility to take into account local character, the scale of the development and other local circumstances.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where appropriate site densities could be less than 30 dph and more than 40 dph.</li> </ul>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/7: Housing Density

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 46</b>	<b>Housing Mix – House Types</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011</li> <li>• SCDC Housing Strategy 2012-2016</li> <li>• Cambridge Housing Sub-Region - Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2010 and subsequent updates</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Lifetime Homes Standard (November 2011): <a href="http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk">www.lifetimehomes.org.uk</a></li> <li>• Cambridge Econometrics population forecasting for South Cambridgeshire to 2031</li> <li>• East of England Forecasting Model population runs for South Cambridgeshire to 2031</li> <li>• 2011 Census output: <a href="http://atlas.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/census/CambsProfiles/atlas.html">http://atlas.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/census/CambsProfiles/atlas.html</a></li> <li>• Cambridgeshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment / Older People 2010: <a href="http://cambridge.newcastlejsna.org.uk/webfm_send/143">http://cambridge.newcastlejsna.org.uk/webfm_send/143</a></li> <li>• Commissioning Strategy for Extra Care Sheltered Housing in Cambridgeshire 2011-15: <a href="http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/48541DEC-6A2D-43E1-8A3E-E5EC62D9833B/0/DeliveryStrategyforExtraCareShelteredHousinginCambridgeshirefinal.pdf">http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/48541DEC-6A2D-43E1-8A3E-E5EC62D9833B/0/DeliveryStrategyforExtraCareShelteredHousinginCambridgeshirefinal.pdf</a></li> </ul>
Existing policies	<p>Policy HG/2 Housing Mix The following AAP policies will remain in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge East AAP Policy CE/7</li> <li>• Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP Policy CSF/7</li> <li>• North West Cambridge AAP Policy NW/7</li> <li>• Northstowe AAP Policy NS/7</li> </ul>
Analysis	<p>Policies in existing AAP will remain in place until that AAP is superseded. Policy HG/2 seeks affordable housing to meet identified needs, and in developments of up to 10 homes market properties should provide at least 40% 1 and 2 bedroom homes, approximately 25% 3 bedroom homes and 25% 4 or more bedroom homes. Larger developments to provide a mix of homes, including 1 and 2 bedroom homes, and secure a balanced community. A proportion of new dwellings should meet lifetime mobility standards.</p> <p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to plan for a mix of housing, based on demographic trends, market trends and the needs of groups such as families with children, older people, people with disabilities and others.</p> <p>The Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 records from page 60 that in the period before housing mix guidance was introduced locally the market trend was for delivery of large 4 bedroom or more properties with relatively few 1 and 2 bedroom properties being provided, and too few to address housing needs. It also records the impact of policy on the increasing provision of smaller properties over time.</p> <p>Surveys of the occupiers of new developments in Cambridgeshire illustrate the market preferences of buyers of new houses to buy the largest house that they can afford, with a significant proportion of 3 bedroom homes or larger being occupied by couples without</p>

	<p>children. Levels of ‘under-occupancy’ in the affordable housing sector being very low and the incidence of ‘over-occupancy’ much higher.</p> <p>The 2011 Census output for the District records that 25% of households consist of 1 person (11.5% pensioners), 31% were households with dependent children, 9% were households with non-dependent children, 32% were households with no children (10% of which were pensioners), and 3% were other types of household.</p> <p>The Commissioning Strategy for Extra Care Sheltered Housing in Cambridgeshire 2011-15 identifies the future needs for specialist accommodation for a growing elderly population. Housing mix restrictions should not apply to such development and design standards should be appropriate to the accommodation being provided.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives</b></p> <p>A number of alternative options have been identified. To not include a housing mix policy. To include a policy only on large sites or only on small sites. To apply housing mix policy only to market housing. If a mix is included that it seek a balance between demographic trends and market preferences.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 46:</b> Which of the following options do you agree with?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Provide no guidance on housing mix (house types).</li> <li>ii. Include a policy on housing mix (house types) but only for market housing.</li> <li>iii. Any policy on housing mix (house types) should only apply to sites of 10 or more homes.</li> <li>iv. Any policy on housing mix (house types) should seek to balance demographic trends for smaller homes with market preferences for larger homes by seeking the provision of market housing as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes,</li> <li>• At least 30% 3 bedroom homes</li> <li>• At least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes</li> <li>• With a 10% allowance for flexibility which can be added to any of the above categories taking account of local circumstances.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Not including a policy regarding housing mix (option i) could risk achievement of the housing objective, as it could mean the mix is not adequate to ensure housing needs are met for the range of needs identified, particularly for smaller dwellings, as the trend historically in the district has been for delivery of larger dwellings unless policy

	<p>required a greater mix. This could have wider impacts for the inclusive communities objectives, as it could impact on equalities related to income. Seeking to balance demographic trends with preferences for smaller homes (option iv) would address a number of these issues, and could positive impact on achievement of the housing objective, by seeking deliver of appropriate house types and sizes.</p> <p>Applying mix to market housing only (option ii) would leave the mix of the affordable housing to be determined by actual identified needs on housing lists, which could therefore provide some additional benefit that actual needs are being reflected.</p> <p>Not applying to developments under 10 (option iii) would miss opportunities to address smaller sites, and as a result could impact on mix achieved in smaller villages, but overall it is likely the bulk of housing will be delivered through larger sites. It could give additional flexibility to address viability issues on smaller sites, or flexibility to reflect the character of the local area (for example an infill plot or redevelopment).</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>i. Support: 18, Object: 1, Comment: 1  ii. Support: 15, Object: 0, Comment: 0  iii. Support: 15, Object: 1, Comment: 2  iv. Support: 23, Object: 5, Comment: 2  Please provide any comments: 27</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p><b>Question 46 i</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing policy has led to an over-supply of small houses and flats which have been taken up for private rental and so not successful in addressing demographic trends</li> <li>• The market should determine the mix for market housing</li> <li>• Support from 3 Parish Councils, consider developments individually and agree a mix to meet need at the time the application is made</li> <li>• This will allow local circumstances, need and the housing market to determine the appropriate housing mix on a development and will encourage a mixed and balanced community</li> <li>• It should not be assumed that small households need or require small houses. It depends on their circumstances, family needs and expectations</li> <li>• The Local Plan should not provide any guidance but refer to the local Parish Council who will be affected by the proposed development.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing no guidance is dangerous</li> </ul>

**Question 46 ii**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support proposal to provide a mixed and balanced community whilst accommodating the necessary flexibility to respond to the specific market conditions at the time
- Support from 5 Parish Councils.

**Question 46 iii**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support from 6 Parish Councils - Agree combination of options iii) & iv), consider how to apply in small villages, it is impractical to try to apply a mix of sizes to small schemes.
- Reduce threshold to 5 or more as a development of 9 single sized properties would not provide an adequately balanced community
- Large houses are often under-occupied. Need for smaller/cheaper house/flats for young couples.

**COMMENTS:**

- The trend of people obtaining planning permission to increase the size of houses across the District demonstrates the futility of seeking to restrict the number of bedrooms.

**Question 46 iv**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- There needs to be a high proportion of smaller and more modest homes, to meet the need to ensure affordability for local buyers
- Support from 12 Parish Councils
- Villages have traditionally evolved with a mix of housing and a mix of residents of different ages. In order to maintain a sense of community you need to have this mix
- Where provision for older people made an allowance must be made for wardens
- Support Option iv which provides an indicative mix whilst allowing for a degree of flexibility. This option allows developments to respond to the identified need whilst at the same time ensuring that a mix of housing is provided to prevent saturation in any one area

**OBJECTIONS:**

- Objections from 2 Parish Councils - Local circumstances as identified by Parish councils should always be sought as part of the policy, 20% flexibility allowance preferred.
- Too prescriptive

**COMMENTS:**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing mixes in new developments to be determined by local housing needs for market and affordable housing.</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy on housing mix that seeks to balance demographic trends for smaller homes with market preferences for larger homes. Such policy to only apply to market homes and only to sites of 10 or more homes, the affordable housing mix to be determined by local housing needs at the time of the development.</p> <p>There was clear support for inclusion of a housing mix policy which would only apply to sites of 10 or more homes and only to market housing. Objectors were concerned that housing mix could be left to the market and that the policy was overly prescriptive. The policy will include three measures to ensure flexibility. First by it only applying to sites of 10 or more homes, second by not applying to sites in infill villages and third by the inclusion of a 10% flexibility allowance that can be added to any of the categories to allow local circumstances to be taken into account. The preferred policy approach will help the Local Plan achieve sustainable development in the District by better matching the new housing to be built over the plan period with the changing household structure of the population.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy will not restrict the mix on housing developments intended to include an element of care which will be determined on their merits.</li> <li>A higher flexibility allowance would reduce the ability of the policy to guide future housing delivery to better match our changing household composition and an aging population.</li> <li>A design led approach to be followed on sites of 9 or fewer homes is unlikely to deliver housing of only one type unless that is appropriate to the local circumstances.</li> </ul>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/8: Housing Mix

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 47</b>	<b>Housing Mix</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 and subsequent updates</li> <li>SCDC Housing Strategy 2012-2016</li> <li>Cambridge Housing Sub-Region - Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2010 and subsequent updates</li> <li>The Lifetime Homes Standard (November 2011): <a href="http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk">www.lifetimehomes.org.uk</a></li> <li>Cambridge Econometrics population forecasting for South Cambridgeshire to 2031</li> <li>East of England Forecasting Model population runs for South Cambridgeshire to 2031</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2011 Census output:  <a href="http://atlas.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/census/CambsProfiles/atlas.html">http://atlas.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/census/CambsProfiles/atlas.html</a> </li> </ul>
Existing policies	Policy HG/2 Housing Mix
Analysis	<p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to plan for a mix of housing, based on demographic trends, market trends and the needs of groups such as families with children, older people, people with disabilities and others.</p> <p>The Housing Strategy 2012-2016 and the available population forecasting for South Cambridgeshire to 2031 all record trends for a rapidly aging population. The LEFM Baseline scenario for example records an increase in the percentage of the population aged 65 and over growing from 17% to 24%. The growth in the population over 65 forming a large proportion of the overall growth in the population of the District. This is clearly illustrated in Chapter 10 of the SHMA at figure 5.</p> <p>The Housing Strategy 2012-2016 from page 26 records data on people with disabilities in South Cambridgeshire. The 2008 Place Survey records 28% of respondents having some long term illness, disability or infirmity. For Council tenants this figure at march 2009 stood at 41%. The Private Sector House Condition Survey (2011/2012) records that 14.3% of such households contain at least one member with a long-term illness or disability. Of these households 45% suffered mobility problems (6.43% of all private sector households). From page 65 the strategy records the pressure on national and local budgets to support vulnerable people in the District. From page 70 it refers to how the Council can support people to live in their own homes as their mobility declines. The SHMA at Chapter 34 table 9 records how the percentage of frailty increases as populations age with 6% of men and 7% of women classified as frail in the 64-74 age band. Further background information can be found in Chapter 35.</p> <p>The Lifetime Homes Standard (November 2011 ) is a widely used national standard for ensuring that the spaces and features in new homes can readily meet the needs of most people, including those with reduced mobility. The Government's strategy requires all new housing built with public funding to meet the Lifetime Home standard by 2011. There have been a number of studies into the costs and benefits of building to the Lifetime Homes standard. These have concluded that the costs range from around £550 to £1650 per dwelling.</p> <p>Having homes built to the Lifetime Homes Standard helps to ensure that housing suits householders' needs and changing circumstances. Whilst lifetime homes can accommodate or adapt to the needs of many wheelchair users, the standards do not match the enhanced</p>

	<p>accessibility provided by a property constructed to the Wheelchair Housing Design standards. At present provision of fully wheelchair accessible housing is only made as part of the affordable housing element of schemes and in response to identified need.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> Choices exist concerning our approach to housing mix to provide for changing needs and reduced mobility. Two alternative approaches have been identified.</p> <p>i. Provide no guidance on making provision in new developments for those with reduced mobility and an ageing population. Provision would be regulated by the Building Regulations which currently do not go so far as the Lifetime Homes Standard.</p> <p>ii. Include a policy in the Local Plan to require 5% of market housing and all affordable housing to meet Lifetime Homes standards. The policy would not require a set provision for fully wheelchair accessible housing. Such provision to be limited to the affordable housing element of developments and then only in response to an identified need.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 47:</b> What approach do you think the new Local Plan should take to securing houses adapted to meet the needs of people with reduced mobility, looking at the following options?</p> <p>i. Provide no guidance on the provision of housing for people with reduced mobility.</p> <p>ii. All affordable and 5% of market housing should be designed to Lifetime Homes standards.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Requiring 5% of market and all affordable housing to be lifetime homes standard (option ii) would have a significant positive impact on the redressing inequalities objective. This option would create higher costs for developers, and could increase the cost of new homes. Not setting a specific requirement (option i) and relying on building regulations could therefore have a negative impact on the redressing inequalities objective, by not requiring any provision in response to specific evidence identified in the Scoping Report that the population structure is ageing.
Representations Received	<p>i. Support: 3, Object: 1, Comment: 1</p> <p>ii. Support: 29, Object: 4, Comment: 2</p> <p>Please provide any comments: 11</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>Question 47 i</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support from 3 Parish Councils – Rely on the Building Regulations. Avoid placing too onerous requirements on new developments. This will increase build costs and house</li> </ul>

prices/rents.

**OBJECTIONS:**

- As with energy efficiency this must be imposed on the developers as it is much more costly to retrofit

**COMMENTS:**

- The laudable aim is likely to produce the wrong houses in the wrong places. The District in conjunction with the County's Social Services is best placed to require given standards for affordable housing

**Question 47 ii**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support from 12 Parish Councils, some seek a higher proportion of Lifetime Homes (255 to 100%).
- As with energy efficiency this must be imposed on the developers as it much more costly to retrofit - enforce it for all new builds
- Cambridgeshire County Council - Given the rise in Cambridgeshire's older population, housing provision needs to / be:
  - Adaptable to meet the needs of people as they grow older
  - Reduce dependence on residential and nursing care, which is likely to focus more on those reaching the end of their lives
  - Reduce social isolation for older people as this contributes to poor health and wellbeing
  - Option ii) is consistent with policy guidance applied elsewhere

**OBJECTIONS:**

- Cambridge City Council - Lack of evidence to support 5% figure given increasing number of older residents
- 1 Parish Council comments that this could reduce amount of affordable housing

**COMMENTS:**

- Suffolk County Council - Standard should be applied more widely than 5% so more choice is available - vital so existing households, whose needs may change, have a wider choice of homes. Important as lack of choice for older people is major cause of under occupation
- Cambridgeshire County Council - The plan needs to consider more strongly the needs of the aging population and the emphasis towards ensuring people can live in their homes longer
- There is no point building housing for those with reduced mobility in an area where there is, for example, no bus service and no local shop, pub or church.

<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include a policy provision requiring that all affordable housing and 5% of market housing be constructed to meet Lifetime Homes Standards.</p> <p>There was strong support for inclusion of a policy. In the main objections were concerned that the approach was too prescriptive, and could add to development costs, whilst others were concerned that all new homes should meet the standard to address the challenges of an aging population. The preferred policy approach will help the Local Plan achieve sustainable development in the District by better matching the new housing to be built over the plan period with the demographic trends for an aging population and known proportions of residents with reduced mobility.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is insufficient evidence to support a requirement that all market homes be built to Lifetime Homes Standards</li> <li>• People with reduced mobility can be expected to live in all parts of the District and cannot be moved to more sustainable locations.</li> </ul>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy H/8: Housing Mix</p>

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 48</b></p>	<p><b>Affordable Housing</b></p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Monitoring Reports</li> <li>• SCDC Housing Register</li> <li>• SCDC Housing Strategy 2012-2016</li> <li>• Cambridge Housing Sub-Region - Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2010 and subsequent updates</li> <li>• The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2012</li> <li>• Settlement summaries of site suitability drawn from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and Sustainability Appraisal assessments</li> <li>• CLG House price and sales indices</li> <li>• Emerging CIL evidence for South Cambridgeshire District Council</li> </ul>
<p>Existing policies</p>	<p>Policy HG/3 Affordable Housing  Policy HG/4 Affordable Housing Subsidy  The following AAP policies will remain in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge East AAP Policy CE/7</li> <li>• Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP Policy CSF/7</li> <li>• North West Cambridge AAP Policy NW/6 and NW/7</li> <li>• Northstowe AAP Policy NS/7</li> </ul>
<p>Analysis</p>	<p>Policies in existing AAP will remain in place until that AAP is superseded. Under policy HG/3 housing developments will only be</p>

permitted if they provide an agreed mix of affordable housing amounting to 40% or more of the additional houses on site. Account is taken of viability and the achievement of mixed and balanced communities. Policy HG/4 allows for the amount of affordable housing to be reduced where circumstances have changed between the grant of planning permission and implementation.

The NPPF states that where there is a need for affordable housing, Local Plans should set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be justified. The policies should contribute to the creation of mixed and balanced communities and be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time.

The Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 from page 49 records the impact of existing affordable housing policies. In the last monitoring year 40% of homes permitted on sites of two or more dwellings were affordable fully meeting the policy target (205 homes). Since then planning permission has been granted for other schemes providing 40% affordable housing and also for a 950 home addition to Cambourne where viability evidence was accepted that provides for 30% affordable housing.

There is a high level of housing need in the district with 3,378 households on the Council housing register as of March 2013. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment<sup>1</sup> records that identifies that 11,838 affordable homes will be required to meet current and arising need in the period to 2031, a considerable proportion of all the homes to be built to 2031, however the delivery of such housing will be constrained by development viability, the availability of land, and the need to create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. This is clearly significantly in excess of the 40% affordable housing that is sought on new market housing schemes for 2 or more dwellings.

The Housing Strategy 2012-2016 at page 40 sets out the Council approach to funding for new affordable housing in the context of the reduced availability of Government subsidy. The reduced availability of subsidy will reduce the amount of social rented housing that can be delivered and increase the amount of affordable rented housing (which requires less subsidy).

The SHLAA 2012 includes an assessment of the viability of all the submitted sites at the current 40% affordable housing policy position together with an assumed rate of Community Infrastructure Levy

---

1

[http://www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/webfm\\_send/548](http://www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/webfm_send/548)

(CIL). It concludes that the majority of sites would be viable to develop at that level. Higher (50%) and lower (30%) affordable housing policy positions were also tested. These tests show that more sites would be viable at 30% and less sites would be viable at a 50% affordable housing policy position. The viability evidence submitted to justify the 30% affordable housing provision at Cambourne indicates that given the scale of infrastructure needed to implement very large urban extensions and new settlements, that in current market conditions 40% affordable housing can sometimes be difficult to achieve. Viability testing for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment also reveals a similar picture of borderline viability in current market conditions regarding the provision of 40% affordable housing in those parts of the District with lower house prices.

Notwithstanding the above analysis, the current adverse market conditions are unlikely to apply to the whole of the period to 2031 and a recovery can be expected in line with past recoveries from economic slowdowns. The Local Plan policy towards affordable housing must be sufficiently flexible to take account of current and changing market conditions over time and this approach is also required by the National Planning Policy Framework.

The existing policy applies to developments in which there is a net increase in dwellings on a site (which is why it applies to developments of 2 or more dwellings). There is anecdotal evidence to show that having a low threshold has reduced the amount of small sites coming forward for development. For very small schemes the net number of new homes will be too small to result in a requirement for the on-site provision of affordable housing leaving provision to be made via a commuted payment in lieu of on-site provision.

#### **Potential for Reasonable Alternatives**

Given the scale of need it would not be reasonable to stop seeking affordable housing contributions from housing development schemes, but choices exist concerning our approach to the target for affordable housing:

- i. We could choose to maintain the current 40% level of affordable housing provided it is accompanied by policy provisions which allow greater flexibility to take account of current and changing market conditions over time. Evidence from the Annual Monitoring Report shows that in almost all cases the Council has been able to secure 40% affordable housing from new housing development, either on site or via financial contributions as an exception to the normal policy of provision on site. However it is proving to be challenging to achieve this level for very large strategic scale sites and there is viability evidence undertaken as part of the Strategic

	<p>Housing Land Availability Assessment which shows that achieving this level currently in some parts of the district with low house prices would threaten the viability of development.</p> <p>ii. A specific reduction in the level of affordable housing to be sought to 30% for very large strategic scale sites and in those parts of the district with low house prices, with 40% elsewhere. Such a change could be accompanied by policy text which would allow flexibility to increase the level to 40% in response to changing market conditions over time.</p> <p>A separate issue is the appropriate threshold for provision of affordable housing to be made. There is evidence that the current threshold of a scheme size of 2 dwellings is discouraging small scale development by placing a greater requirement on very small schemes. The Council could increase the threshold to 3 or more, subject to viability, to encourage more small scale developments to come forward.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 48:</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> What target should the Local Plan include to address the need for affordable housing?</p> <p>i) The target for affordable housing remains at 40% of the number of dwellings granted planning permission accompanied by policy provisions which explicitly allow greater flexibility to take account of current and changing market conditions over time.</p> <p>ii) The target for affordable housing is reduced to 30% of the number of dwellings granted planning permission in relation to very large strategic scale sites and in those parts of the district with low house prices and remains at 40% elsewhere. Such a change could allow flexibility to increase the level to 40% across the district in response to changing market conditions over time.</p> <p><b>B:</b> The threshold for seeking affordable housing provision could be increased to 3 dwellings or another higher number. What number would you prefer and why?</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>The highest option for delivery of affordable homes (option i) would make the greatest contribution to the housing objectives, reflecting the level of affordable housing need present in the district, however this has to be balanced with viability and deliverability. The alternative option (option ii) could provide greater flexibility to address viability, and could therefore actually support higher levels of housing delivery overall, although the proportion of affordable could be lower.</p> <p>The threshold of two or more homes contributing to affordable housing also seeks to maximise contributions, therefore delivering a significant positive impact against the housing objective. Setting a</p>

	<p>slightly higher threshold of 3 dwellings (option iii) could support delivery of very small housing schemes, but overall impact on affordable housing would be relatively small, given the majority of development comes from larger schemes.</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>Ai. Support: 25, Object: 18, Comment: 16  Aii. Support: 24, Object: 4, Comment: 6  B. Support: 21, Object: 2, Comment: 23  Please provide any comments: 29</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p><b>Question 48 i</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 8 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• Support a general target for affordable housing at 40% if accompanied by provisions which allow greater flexibility to take account of current and changing market conditions as well as other elements of community benefit within a scheme.</li> <li>• 40% is well established by previous appeal decisions and precedents</li> <li>• We need a strong policy in the light of the large amount of need</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prefer more flexibility</li> <li>• 1 Parish Council objects that if people cannot afford larger houses, developers will not build them.</li> <li>• Affordable housing should be reduced to 30% and only apply to development of over 10 dwellings to ensure that small-scale developments and windfalls are not discouraged which frustrates delivery and erodes local character</li> <li>• The target for affordable housing should be reduced to 30% on all sites. The current economic climate is such that viability of developments is increasingly an issue.</li> <li>• Each site to be judged on its own merits</li> <li>• There should be no affordable housing requirement.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested proportions do not make sense. To obtain target quantity of affordable housing, over 22,000 market houses would have to be built. These would encourage people with no link to area to move in, and create intolerable pressure on services and environment. Increase in population would be equivalent to 40% of present population of Cambridge.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 48 ii</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 15 Parish Councils. Comments include that the criteria that can trigger this change of threshold must be clearly defined.</li> </ul>

- Very large strategic sites need to be defined/quantified, and 'those parts of the district with low house prices' need to be identified to avoid uncertainty
- Flexibility is a good thing in a long term plan
- Past affordable housing delivery has been roughly 24%. Indicates realistic, deliverable and viable proportion of affordable housing. Given many sites were delivered prior to economic downturn situation is likely to have worsened. Target should be reduced to 30% and annual housing target increased to make up difference
- The target for affordable housing should be reduced to 30% on all sites. The current economic climate is such that viability of developments is increasingly becoming an issue. Sites will not be built out if developers cannot make a profit
- The policy for the provision of affordable housing should recognise the substantial up front infrastructure costs involved in starting very large strategic scale sites
- A lower target of 30% would be likely to ensure that a greater proportion of sites are brought forward without the need for lengthy s106 re-negotiations

**OBJECTIONS:**

- There should be no requirement that developers be extorted - they should build what they feel can be sold.

**COMMENTS:**

- A target should not be specified unless the policy is worded to have full regard to the advice in the NPPF, (paragraph 47's footnote) in respect of deliverable and developable sites, particularly in relation to their viability
- It appears that a 40% target is probably appropriate for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, but we would support the suggested reduction to 30% for very large strategic scale sites and the introduction of some flexibility in affordable housing requirements to take into account market conditions
- 40% is far too high. Indeed 30% seems very high. There is always somewhere cheaper to live. So, keep the requirements reasonable - we should be after upgrading the capabilities of our local population to provide economic growth
- The lower number of affordable housing would mean that the village would be able to retain its character. Affordable housing is not usually built with the same design quality or character as those which are "independent" and it is crucial that the villages are able to retain their look and feel. Where affordable housing is built this should be used to reduce the numbers on the waiting list in the South Cambridgeshire area and not those from elsewhere

**Question 48 B**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support from 15 Parish Councils – most support a threshold of 3, others favour a higher threshold of 5, or 10.
- Some common sense needs to be applied, so that a small development of less than 4 houses are not liable for the affordable housing or offset requirements. This will enable fairer competition and access for small developers or individuals in this market place
- The (current) discouragement of small developments is important. They fit in well, do not dominate neighbouring dwellings and should be encouraged. Suggest four is the appropriate number
- I believe that the threshold should be increased to 10, to provide our local community with new market housing that compares with existing local dwellings
- Moving threshold to 3 would allow more windfall development and provision of housing in smaller villages

**OBJECTIONS:**

- The threshold should remain at the current 2 dwellings
- Affordable housing should only apply to development of over 10 dwellings to ensure that small-scale development sites and windfall sites are not discouraged from being developed which frustrates delivery and erodes the local character

**COMMENTS:**

- Social housing provision should not apply where houses are built for the use of the owner or their family
- At low thresholds it is impracticable for the development to include affordable homes on site. The developer has to pay a sum in lieu. It is a question of market economics as to the effect of such impositions on small developments will have on housing provision
- Various different thresholds suggested including 1, 5, 6, 7, 15 or 20.
- However if the policy were to remain at 2 dwellings or more we would seek a higher threshold (e.g. 5 or more) for seeking on-site provision as the '1 private, 1 affordable' is an unnecessary burden on developers. An off-site financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision for developments of between 2 (or 3 if the new change applies) and 4 dwellings would be encouraged
- A suggested number would be on sites over 0.5ha or 15 dwellings, as per the policy in the neighbouring authority Uttlesford District Council or even their emerging policy which seeks 20% on between 5-14 dwellings and 40% on sites of 15 units or more
- Consultation should be undertaken with RSL's regarding the minimum number of units they would require for a site to be

	viable from their point of view and the threshold for providing on site affordable houses set at that level. Developments below this should use an off-site contribution formula based on the current model, but modified to include issues such as viability.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy requiring the provision of affordable housing on qualifying sites except where to do so would make a development unviable or where off-site provision can be justified or a financial contribution accepted in place of on-site provision.</p> <p>There was on-going support for the inclusion of an affordable housing policy in the Local Plan to address high levels of housing need in the District. Objections to the policy were concerned with impacts on site viability and deliverability and particularly in relation to large strategic sites. There was a clear majority of support for raising the qualifying threshold for the policy to apply from 2 net new dwellings on a site to a higher number but mixed views about whether this should be set at 3 dwellings or a higher number.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers only build part of the housing required to address housing needs, being open market housing, the remainder requires subsidy and is known as affordable housing.</li> <li>• Future household and population forecasts which underlay the plan include provision for all tenures of housing. Affordable housing provision is not an additional or different number.</li> <li>• Urban extensions and new settlements will have bespoke site development and infrastructure costs and their viability will need careful examination over the life of the plan.</li> <li>• 40% has been proven to be achievable over the majority of the District and provided the policy explicitly allows for viability to be taken into account can be considered to form an appropriate starting point for future affordable housing negotiations.</li> </ul>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/9: Affordable Housing

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 49</b>	<b>Exception Sites Affordable Housing</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Monitoring Reports</li> <li>• Village Housing Needs Surveys (Cambridge Su Regional Rural Housing Enabling Project led by Cambridgeshire ACRE)</li> <li>• SCDC Housing Strategy 2012-2016</li> <li>• Cambridge Housing Sub-Region - Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2010 and subsequent updates</li> <li>• The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2012</li> <li>• Settlement summaries of site suitability drawn from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and</li> </ul>

	<p>Sustainability Appraisal assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England 2011</li> <li>• National Self Build Action Plan 2011</li> <li>• Self-build as a Volume Housebuilding Solution 2008</li> <li>• <a href="http://www.selfbuildportal.org.uk/">http://www.selfbuildportal.org.uk/</a></li> </ul>
Existing policies	Policy HG/5 Exceptions sites for Affordable Housing
Analysis	<p>An exception site is currently a site that provides 100% affordable housing located within or adjoining a rural settlement, as an exception to normal planning policy.</p> <p>The Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 at page 51 records the completion of 313 homes on rural exception sites between 2004/2005 and 2010/2011 an average of 85 per year.</p> <p>The Village Housing Needs Surveys reveal a need for 743 new affordable homes in rural villages, of which 69 have been provided to date through the existing exception site policy HG/5. Work continues in those villages where a need has been identified but not yet met to find suitable sites to develop affordable housing. Some villages only need a couple of affordable housing units, which currently makes them unviable for affordable purposes, but if the needs of neighbouring villages can be combined a scheme may be more viable.</p> <p>The NPPF supports the use of rural exception sites to meet local needs and asks Local Planning Authorities to consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs.</p> <p>The Council has experienced a number of practical difficulties with implementation of the policy. Many villages have a need for affordable housing but not at a level that could support a housing development unless the needs of a number of villages could be considered together.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives</b></p> <p>The Local Plan could continue to require that 100% of the housing provided on exception sites is affordable. However, it is no longer expected that there will be government grant available to help fund affordable housing and therefore some new method needs to be identified to help secure funding for affordable houses on exceptions sites if such sites are to continue to come forward. As set out in the NPPF, the proposed method is to allow some market housing to help cross fund affordable housing. Options are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. To allow the minimum amount of market housing necessary on an exception site make the provision of significant affordable housing viable.</li> <li>ii. Considering the wider issue of housing provision in smaller</li> </ol>

	<p>villages as discussed in the Issues and Options Report Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy, if there is a desire to provide for a little more market housing to achieve dual objectives of securing affordable housing and also some limited additional market housing in villages, the level could be set at a higher level than 40% so that a greater proportion of affordable housing is secured than on normal market sites.</p> <p>See also the consideration of village frameworks at Issue 15. The two issues need to be considered together and if there is a desire to see greater flexibility at villages, this will help inform a decision on which approach may best target meeting local housing needs, having considered whether there is a desire to continue to secure exceptions sites in some form. See also Issue 7 on Localism.</p> <p>A further issue is whether it would provide greater flexibility in providing for local needs if the exception site policy allowed the housing needs of a group of neighbouring villages to be taken into account in bringing forward an exception site, particularly to assist those villages where need is very low and it is proving difficult to identify suitable exception sites or villages where need is high but there are no suitable exception sites. This would allow the occupation of exception site affordable housing to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those resident in the parish within which the exception site is located; and</li> <li>• Those resident in the group of neighbouring villages even if outside the parish; and</li> <li>• Those who have an employment connection to the village within which the exception site is located; and</li> <li>• Those who have a family connection to that local community.</li> </ul>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p><b>Question 49:</b></p> <p><b>A.</b> What approach do you think the Local Plan should take to affordable housing on rural exception sites?</p> <p>i) Allow the minimum amount of market housing necessary on exception sites to make the affordable housing viable?</p>

	<p>ii) Provide more market housing to support local communities, the Local Plan could allow a greater amount of market housing on exception sites to support the provision of a significant amount of affordable housing.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Do you think the Local Plan should allow greater flexibility in the occupation of exception site affordable housing to include the needs of a group of neighbouring villages?</p>
<p>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</p>	<p>Exception sites are a mechanism of delivering affordable housing in rural communities, they therefore contribute to the housing and redressing inequalities objectives. If market housing could facilitate the delivery of higher numbers of affordable homes by addressing viability, this could have a greater impact, although the scale of this is not clear at this stage. All options could involve use of greenfield land on the edges of villages. Allowing a higher level of market housing (option Aii) could involve a greater scale of development to achieve the same number of affordable dwellings, although impact on landscape and townscape would be addressed by other policy options.</p> <p>Option B could provide greater flexibility to enable housing needs to be met more effectively.</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>Ai. Support: 20, Object: 9, Comment: 5  Aii. Support: 27, Object: 5, Comment: 10  B. Support: 9, Object: 19, Comment: 10  Please provide any comments: 22</p> <p>Questionnaire question 7:  Comment: 649  (Plus 301 Comberton petitioners of which of which 267 signatories have been individually registered)</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p><b>Question 49 Ai</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current exception site policy unfairly restricts certain groups of the community including first timers, upsizers and downsizers, preventing them from remaining within the settlement or forcing unsatisfactory conditions upon them. Allowing mixed affordable and market housing exception sites would help address a wider range of local needs</li> <li>• Support from 8 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• Endorse the pragmatic approach being proposed by the Council to facilitate the development of 'affordable housing' on exception sites, the level could be set higher than 40% so a greater proportion of affordable housing is secured than normal market sites</li> <li>• In order to make each development viable, a minimum amount of market housing should be allowed. The amount should be</li> </ul>

judged on a case by case basis

**OBJECTIONS:**

- Objections from 3 Parish Councils.
- Greater levels of market housing should be allowed on exceptions sites to help provide and support local community facilities
- Maximum of 25% market would be acceptable

**COMMENTS:**

- Comments from 3 Parish Councils - all affordable housing on exception sites should be allocated to existing residents requiring different types of properties and those with strong family connections, the new exception site policy should insist that the first 6 and thereafter a minimum of 60% of the dwellings are affordable, the market housing should be of a type suitable for first-time buyers/tenants.

**Question 49 Aii**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support option ii - to address community balance. There is a risk of creating affordable housing ghettos on the edge of villages
- Support approach. This should be set out in a defined policy target rather than relying upon viability discussions. These can often be protracted and complicated and act as a barrier to the delivery of affordable housing
- Support from 7 Parish Councils.
- Current exception site policy unfairly restricts certain groups of the community including first timers, upsizers and downsizers, preventing them from remaining within the settlement or forcing unsatisfactory conditions upon them. Allowing mixed affordable and market housing exception sites would help address a wider range of local needs
- This is a sensible approach, which will encourage landowners to release such land and we therefore support this policy option

**OBJECTIONS:**

- Objections from 3 Parish Councils.
- Exception sites are outside the village envelope so should not be used as development land in the first place.
- Increasing the proportion of market housing on exception sites might well make a particular site more viable to the developer and/or landowner but the affordable dwellings thus displaced would then have to be built somewhere else

**COMMENTS:**

- Why would "exception sites" be treated differently to normal sites? Parish Councils must be able to refuse permission for

building and for that decision not to be overruled

**Question 49 B**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- (1) If Exception site policy used, it should ensure it cannot be used to circumvent other policies and ensure level playing field. (2) Land should be valued at the same rate for both. (3) Private housing element should only cover the development costs; additional revenue should be used to enhance local community facilities. (4) The developer and owner of the site should be a "not for profit organisation". (5) It should have the support of the Parish Council
- Support from 3 Parish Councils.
- To an extent it does already. If an affordable house cannot be occupied by a local for a range of valid reasons then the offer is extended to neighbouring villages
- It would seem only common sense to allow flexibility within local communities to use affordable housing on exception sites to the best advantage of the families that need such housing

**OBJECTIONS:**

- Objections from 10 Parish Councils.
- Do not support. Erosion of the principle of local communities having preference would reduce the number of locally supported sites being brought forward. This issue of insufficient local applicants for a development is already addressed through current letting policies
- Affordable exception sites should be kept solely for local people and those with a direct link to the village

**COMMENTS:**

- Comments from 4 Parish Councils - The flexibility should only be introduced if villages are working together. If a village develops an exception site to meet affordable housing within their village, residents or people who have long term employment or strong family connections to the village must take priority over households who have no real connection to the village or group of villages, occupants from other villages should only be considered once the affordable needs of the providing village have been met in full.
- The Council already allows full flexibility bearing in mind Section 106 Agreements allow the affordable units to be occupied by any person in need across the district
- Yes. Clustering villages is a very good idea, as it is obvious that not all villages have the potential for exception sites. It requires close working for all villages concerned, but it is achievable in the spirit of localism
- Each development should be taken on its own merits and the

	<p>needs of the individual community. Not all villages will benefit from additional development due to the stress it would place on existing facilities, services and infrastructure</p> <p><b>Questionnaire Question 7:</b> A similar range of comments to those captured above under Q49A i and ii.</p>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy regarding the provision of affordable housing on rural exception sites, subject to a number of criteria including allowing a minimum proportion of market housing where this is essential to make a scheme viable.</p> <p>There was on-going support for the inclusion of a rural exception site affordable housing policy in the Local Plan to address high levels of local housing need in the District. The inclusion of an element of affordable housing was supported to ensure viability. Objections to were concerned with whether a higher proportion of market housing should be allowed to avoid the creation of affordable housing estates and to encourage landowners to release more land. Others were concerned that to do so would ignore local needs and reduce the amount of affordable housing that can be provided.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requiring that the first 6 and then 60% of exception site housing be affordable would not take into account the scale of the development or evidence of viability</li> <li>• The Council will determine what market housing element if any will be needed based upon viability evidence</li> <li>• Parish Councils cannot refuse planning applications because they are not a planning authority.</li> </ul>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/10: Rural Exception Site Affordable Housing

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 50</b>	<b>Residential Space Standards</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Homes and Communities Agency's (HCA) Housing Quality Indicators (HQI): <a href="http://www.homesandcommunities.co.uk/hqi">http://www.homesandcommunities.co.uk/hqi</a></li> <li>• Examples of space standards already included in Local Planning documents from other local planning authorities.</li> <li>• 1985 Housing Act (bedroom sizes)</li> <li>• Various research documents from CABE: <a href="http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/files/space-standards-the-benefits.pdf">http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/files/space-standards-the-benefits.pdf</a> and <a href="http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/housing/standards">http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/housing/standards</a></li> </ul>
Existing policies	None

<p>Analysis</p>	<p>Historically, there has been very limited national guidance on the issues connected with space standards within and around the home. However, Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) did provide support for the development of residential space and layout standards although none are explicit about what such guidance should contain. The National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Planning Authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as families with children, the elderly and people with disabilities). If homes are to have a long and sustainable life, they must offer functional and adaptable spaces that meet the needs of such different groups.</p> <p>Furthermore, the pressure for housing along with the cost of land and the need for developers to ensure that buyers can afford to buy, means that internal and external space have been reduced in market housing over the years. UK homes usually have less internal floor space than those in Europe and this can result in households choosing (where they can afford to), to buy a house with more bedrooms than they need to gain additional living space on the ground floor of a property.</p> <p>A number of other Local Authorities have started to set out their own space standards: The London Housing Design Guide, and the Ashford Borough Council Residential space and layout SPD include standards which are based on existing Lifetime Homes standards and basic furniture and activity spaces derived from HCA's Housing Quality Indicators. Most of the Local Authorities which are already using space standards are those located in the London Boroughs, these are again derived from existing HCA standards, but one notable exception is the Mid-Sussex District Council which has produced standards based on those originally adopted by English Partnerships.</p> <p>Other common problems that can be addressed by such standards include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring that there is adequate natural light and ventilation to all habitable rooms.</li> <li>• Provision of adequate internal and external space including bedroom sizes and kitchens that have adequate circulation space for the anticipated use and that there is sufficient recreational space</li> <li>• Minimising noise disturbance by ensuring that bedrooms are located on the aspect furthest from a known regular noise generating sources including busy roads and railway lines. This may be less costly than installing additional sound insulation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Potential for reasonable alternatives</b></p> <p>Three alternative options have been identified. If no guidance is</p>
-----------------	---

	<p>provided on space standards in new market housing would essentially be controlled by the market and what people want to buy and can afford to buy.</p> <p>Guidance could either include space and layout standards in the Local Plan or include a more general policy in the Local Plan and include the space and layout standards in a Supplementary Planning Document, this latter option would allow the standards to be more easily changed if national standards change or if experience points to the need for changes to better meet local conditions.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 50:</b> Do you think that new homes are often too small? How do you think we should deal with the size of new homes?</p> <p>i) Not include a policy on residential space standards in the Local Plan.</p> <p>ii) Include a policy on residential space standards in the Local Plan which would cover both affordable and market housing and which would be consistent with national standards set by the Homes and Communities Agency.</p> <p>iii) Include a more general policy on residential space standards in the Local Plan and include the actual standards in a Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Setting residential space standards could help to deliver spaces that work well, meeting housing needs more effectively and promote healthy communities. It is difficult to quantify the scale of the impact beyond what the market would deliver anyway, but a policy would ensure a minimum standard is met. Including standards in a local plan (option ii) may provide greater certainty regarding implementation than including standards in a supplementary planning document (option iii), but less ability to adapt if circumstances change.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i. Support: 5, Object: 3, Comment: 1 ii. Support: 26, Object: 0, Comment: 0 iii. Support: 18, Object: 0, Comment: 5 Please provide any comments: 16</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>Question 50i</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will add to development costs. The effect would be to either frustrate the delivery of growth or alternatively increase the costs of new homes, which will make them less affordable. This should</li> </ul>

	<p>be left to the market to determine.</p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New houses are too small - once they are built purchasers have very little choice so guidance is needed, developers often cut corners providing rooms that are too small to fulfil their advertised functions - such as bedrooms that can hardly fit a single bed, or living rooms furnished in show homes with under-sized furniture.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 50ii</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 13 Parish Councils. New houses are too small - once they are built purchasers have very little choice so guidance is needed. Include reference to Lifetime Homes Standards (LHS).</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council - Given the financial implications for developers, particularly on the larger development sites, it is key to include such a policy in the Local Plan.</li> <li>• Some degree of control to ensure reasonably sized rooms are provided is sensible</li> <li>• Put it into the plan. The SPD may never be written</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 50iii</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 2 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• This is sensible as it avoids developer led rabbit hutch designs and gives you flexibility to amend to keep up to date with best practice.</li> <li>• Some minimum sizes would be appropriate to ensure that substandard accommodation is not created. These are best delivered within an SPD which can be easily updated</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan standards should be for larger rooms and spaces than currently stipulated. It is a tragedy that England's new housing stock is so cramped. Choose the best available European standard.</li> </ul>
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include a policy on minimum residential space standards based on those of the Homes and Communities Agency applicable only to new market housing (on the basis that affordable homes must already comply with the standards and with the Lifetime Homes standard). Including the actual standards in the policy.</p> <p>There is strong support for inclusion of a minimum standards policy within the plan with objections that this should be left to market forces.</p>

	In response to specific issues raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standards assume normal furniture sizes and adequate storage and circulation space.</li> </ul>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/11: Residential Space Standards for Market Housing

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 51</b>	<b>Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning application decision notices and appeal decisions concerning policy HG/6</li> <li>Submission from Great Abington Parish Council dated May 2012, concerning extensions to dwellings in the Land Settlement Association area</li> </ul>
Existing policies	Policy HG/6 Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside
Analysis	<p>Policy HG/6 is intended to prevent harm to the amenity of the countryside through inappropriate development and to help protect the stock of small and medium sized dwellings in the countryside because of the level of need for such dwellings. It imposes a limit on new floorspace or volume of 50% of the original building.</p> <p>Implementation of the policy has been attended by a number of contrary decisions where the policy has been overturned at planning application stage and on appeal.</p> <p>S/1123/08/F - 91% increase in volume. Allowed on appeal. No effect on the character and appearance of the countryside.</p> <p>S/0668/10/F – 100% plus increase in floor area. Allowed on appeal. No effect on the character and appearance of the countryside.</p> <p>S/1380/11 – Extension above 50% volume approved.</p> <p>S/0064/08/F – 95% increase in floor area. Recommended for refusal, approved by Planning Committee.</p> <p>The policy actively seeks to prevent extensions which would enable the conversion of existing properties into two dwellings which will have had the effect of preventing the creation of additional small dwellings in the countryside because of concerns that the location of such dwellings is unsustainable usually being distant from services and facilities and not well served by public transport. These concerns are real but should be balanced by the reasonable expectation that the number of such new dwellings</p> <p><b>Potential for reasonable alternatives</b></p> <p>The Local Plan could:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete the policy and rely on design policies to consider matters</li> </ol>

	<p>such as design quality, local character, traffic, countryside and landscape character and the scale and nature of the development.</p> <p>ii. Include a simplified version of the policy which would remove limitations concerning height, floorspace, volume and the requirement for the extension to be in scale and character with the existing dwelling (relying on the design policies to ensure design quality and amenity).</p> <p>iii. Include a simplified version of the policy as in b, which would in addition remove limitations concerning the creation of a separate dwelling.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 51:</b> How do you think the Local Plan should deal with extensions to dwellings in the countryside?</p> <p>i) Not include a policy.</p> <p>ii) Include a simplified version of the policy requiring the extension to be in scale and character with the existing dwelling.</p> <p>iii) Include a simplified version of the policy as in b), but also remove from it limitations concerning the creation of a separate dwelling.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>All three options propose to control the impact of extensions to dwellings, therefore have a positive impact on the landscape and townscape objective. Option iii would have a positive impact on housing objectives by allowing buildings to be used more flexibly to create an additional dwelling, although there could be consequential impacts on promoting sustainable travel.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i. Support: 4, Object: 5, Comment: 2</p> <p>ii. Support: 33, Object: 2, Comment: 3</p> <p>iii. Support: 4, Object: 6, Comment: 0</p> <p>Please provide any comments: 10</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>Question 51i</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete the policy. Extensions to homes in the countryside should be allowed on the same basis as homes within village boundaries, or more generously as they would not inconvenience neighbours.</li> <li>• The number of relatively poorly paid workers in the countryside</li> </ul>

locally is dwindling. To prevent such a cottage from being converted into a modern dwelling could result in that cottage falling derelict. I would abandon any policy on the matter.

**OBJECTIONS:**

- The District Council should have a strong policy to ensure against any inappropriate development
- A clear policy is needed to prevent haphazard development of extensions

**Question 51ii**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support from 14 Parish Councils.
- The proposed policy is what is actually being applied by SCDC at the moment
- Planned development in the countryside should be treated no differently than development in a village, town, or even green-belt. If the need exists, and/or the proposal is sustainable, then development should be permitted.
- Include a simplified policy requiring extensions to be in scale and character with existing property. Do not constrain landowners rights unnecessarily. Prohibiting creation of an extra unit would not be consistent with principle of allowing small scale infill development in villages
- A percentage increase limitation serves no purpose. For example it does not ensure the existing houses in the countryside are available for local people or will be affordable to local people. Relevant considerations are the impact of extensions on the character of the surrounding area and that should be the governing factor for acceptable development

**OBJECTIONS:**

- Proposals should be judged upon their individual merits and not overly restricted by blanket constraints and prejudged presumptions

**COMMENTS:**

- I'm not sure the current policy works, as the land is still too expensive to allow someone of limited means to obtain the property even if tiny. So it doesn't help those it's meant to help

**Question 51iii**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Prohibiting the creation of an additional unit (e.g. "granny flat") would be inconsistent with the principles of allowing small scale development adjacent to village frameworks or appropriate development within residential gardens (I&O1 Issues 15 and 53)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not see why there would be an objection to building a separate dwelling -would that not make them more affordable?</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional dwellings should not be allowed, except for those for use by the owner and their family, and which are tied by law to remain under single ownership</li> <li>A removal of restrictions on the development of separate dwellings is likely to produce unexpected consequences that might be undesirable. Whenever planning permission is sought for a separate dwelling, the request should be dealt with individually</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a simplified less restrictive policy concerning the extension of dwellings in the countryside but which retains the policy against the formation of a separate dwelling as part of the process.</p> <p>There is strong support for the inclusion of a simplified less restrictive policy, with objections that no policy is needed, that the existing policy should be retained and that extensions to permit the formation of a separate dwelling should be permitted.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number of plots suitable for small scale development in villages which is allowed by policy is very much smaller than the number of properties which could be extended to create a separate dwelling. To allow extensions to create separate dwellings would thus be contrary to the sustainable spatial strategy of the plan to concentrate development in the most sustainable settlements.</li> </ul>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/12: Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 52</b>	<b>Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anecdotal comments from Development Control officers that when policy HG/7 is explained to prospective applicants for planning permission to extend a house, the outcome is usually that no planning application is made and the property is extended under the General Permitted Development Order</li> <li>Housing Strategy for England 2011 (HMG)</li> <li>Self-Build as a Volume House Building Solution 2008 (NASBA)</li> <li>National Self Build Action Plan 2011</li> <li><a href="http://www.selfbuildportal.org.uk/">http://www.selfbuildportal.org.uk/</a></li> </ul>
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Policy HG/7 Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside
Analysis	Many dwellings in the countryside (outside village development

frameworks) were built at a time when families had few possessions and were used to living in cramped crowded conditions. These dwellings although small, often sit on large plots of land. Today these properties can be ill-suited for modern family life but remain expensive to purchase or rent because of the land that comes with the dwelling. Such properties are found across the district but with a notable concentration at the Land Settlement Association Estate at Great Abington.

The existing policy includes a rule to prevent increases in volume greater than 15% of the original building. Implementation of the policy has often been sidestepped by owners exercising their General Permitted Development Order rights to expand their homes (up to a 15% volume increase). This takes them outside the ambit of planning control altogether but can often result in accommodation which would not have been the preferred solution for the owner.

This policy may also have had the unintended effects of preventing the reuse of large housing plots to provide high quality executive homes, and for small and medium sized plots, of preventing their use for self-build housing in that one key attraction of self-build is to allow people to live in a more spacious home than could otherwise have been afforded. The NPPF states that the needs of people wishing to build their own homes should be taken into account in the planned mix of housing to be provided. The Government wants to support more people to build their own homes and in the Housing Strategy for England 2011 consideration is given to Custom Built Homes. The Custom Build industry is important for the national economy. It is worth approximately £3.6 billion a year, safeguarding and creating new jobs, strengthening the construction supply chain and making a real contribution to local economies. Currently custom home builders are building as many homes each year as each of individual volume housebuilders, with around 13,800 custom homes completed in the UK in 2010/11. Custom Build Housing also brings other benefits, providing affordable bespoke-designed market housing, promoting design quality, environmental sustainability, driving innovation in building techniques and entrepreneurialism.

Reports on self-build have identified the main problem to the expansion of self-build as the availability of suitable plots of land. The report 'Self Build as a Volume Housebuilding Solution 2008' states that "at present there are many more people seeking suitable sites, than there are plots available. At any one time there are around 6,000 plots listed in the UK; yet there are tens of thousands of people chasing them; perhaps as many as 50,000. Bear in mind too that many of the sites that are available are in parts of the UK where there is less demand (for example in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland), and some of the sites are not well suited to housing (backing onto railway lines or motorways, for example). In

	<p>urban areas site finding problems are often compounded as small pockets of land suitable for self builders only very rarely become available and they are often prohibitively expensive. And in rural areas – where many self builders would prefer to build – land availability is constrained by tight planning regulations or Green Belt restrictions.”</p> <p><b>Potential for reasonable alternatives:</b></p> <p>Two alternative options have been identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Keep the existing policy and continue to limit replacement dwellings in the countryside to being no more than 15% larger than the dwelling they replace; or</li> <li>ii. Keep the requirement that the use of the dwelling has not been abandoned and that caravans will not be permitted to be replaced by permanent dwellings but delete the remainder of the policy and rely on the design policies of the Local Plan to consider such matters as design quality, scale, local character and countryside impact.</li> </ul>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 52:</b> How do you think the Local Plan should address the issue of replacing existing housing in the countryside?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Keep the existing policy and continue to limit replacement dwellings in the countryside to being no more than 15% larger than the dwelling they replace.</li> <li>ii) Include a less restrictive policy on replacement dwellings in the countryside.</li> </ul>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Both options propose to enable replacement dwellings in the countryside, but offer alternative methods of ensuring protection of the landscape. Keeping a size restriction (option i) would provide greater certainty, but a more flexible policy (option ii) with appropriate policy guidance could also achieve the objectives, whilst enabling greater flexibility regarding the design of homes.</p>
Representations Received	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Support: 18, Object: 6, Comment: 1</li> <li>ii. Support: 28, Object: 1, Comment: 4</li> </ul> <p>Please provide any comments: 7</p>
Key Issues from	<b>Question 52i</b>

Representations	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replacement dwellings in the countryside should preserve the variety of homes found in villages</li> <li>• Support from 8 Parish Councils - It is important to maintain housing mix, no carte blanche for development.</li> <li>• Isolated housing in the countryside - excepting genuine farm buildings - is a bad thing. Almost all journeys to &amp; from these houses are by car</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new policy should be much less restrictive, and not set limits to the maximum size of the new dwelling</li> <li>• Application proposals should be judged upon their individual merits and not overly restricted by blanket constraints and prejudged presumptions</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 52ii</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new policy should be much less restrictive, and not set limits to the maximum size of the new dwelling. The restriction on abandoned homes should not apply to previously demolished country houses, especially where the proposal is to rebuild them on an 'as it was, where it was' basis</li> <li>• Support from 13 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• There should be consistency with the intended extensions policy and with that in mind: a replacement dwelling, or dwellings, shall be permitted in the curtilage of the existing dwelling to a maximum height of and up to a doubling of the floorspace of the existing dwelling, - caravans will not be permitted to be replaced by a permanent dwelling BUT (unlike current policy), - dwellings that have been abandoned may be refurbished or replaced</li> <li>• A percentage increase limitation serves no purpose. It does not ensure the existing houses in the countryside are available for local people or will be affordable to local people. The relevant considerations are the impact of extensions on the character of the surrounding area</li> <li>• Support this as it would allow smaller dwellings to be replaced with dwellings sufficiently enlarged to use modern technology for energy efficiency, bring up to standard for size of rooms (especially kitchens) and enable families to occupy dwellings previously too small</li> <li>• The rule on caravans needs to be retained</li> <li>• Consider other ways of limiting overall size e.g imposing a maximum square metre limit</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	Include a simplified less restrictive policy concerning replacement dwellings in the countryside.

	<p>There is clear support for the inclusion of a less restrictive policy on replacement dwellings which retains the policy against allowing caravans being replaced by permanent dwellings and which relies upon other plan policies including the design policies to consider such matters as design quality, scale, local character and countryside impact.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy creates no 'carte blanche' for development. Any replacement dwelling still has to be satisfactory in terms of design and impacts to gain planning permission.</li> <li>• It is not practicable to permit long demolished country houses to be rebuilt, their design may not enhance their setting and their architecture may not be of a high standard. See new policy on countryside homes of exceptional quality.</li> </ul>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/13: Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 53</b>	<b>Development of Residential Gardens</b>
Key evidence	N/A
Existing policies	N/A
Analysis	<p>The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to consider the case for setting out policies to resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example when development would cause harm to the local area.</p> <p>Government planning guidance before June 2010 classified residential gardens as previously developed land (PDL), and strongly encouraged local planning authorities to achieve the national target of 60% of residential development being on PDL. This led to concerns about overdevelopment of neighbourhoods and 'garden grabbing'. The new Government in 2010 took action to remove gardens from the PDL classification in recognition that many local authorities felt forced into granting planning permission for unwanted development on garden land - simply to maintain the brownfield target.</p> <p>Proposals for the residential development of gardens in South Cambridgeshire have led to concerns including impacts on residential amenity, local character, heritage and traffic. Where acceptable however they can make use of large garden plots in locations close to existing services and facilities and reduce the need for development in the open countryside.</p> <p>In some cases, development on gardens may be appropriate as it:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces the need to extend development into the countryside;</li> <li>• Creates new homes without the need for significant increased infrastructure provision;</li> <li>• Provides better use of land in areas where people no longer demand large gardens due to lifestyle changes; and</li> <li>• Provides small sites appropriate for local developers who employ local people.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments against developing on gardens include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased building mass;</li> <li>• Loss of or change in local character;</li> <li>• Increased population density;</li> <li>• A gradual associated increase in demand on local infrastructure;</li> <li>• Loss of green space and paving over gardens;</li> <li>• A reduction in habitats and biodiversity; and</li> <li>• An increased risk of flash flooding due to increased run off.</li> </ul> <p>In considering proposed development on residential gardens the following factors are taken into account: local character and the implications for residential amenity, siting, design, scale, materials, access, traffic and parking, heritage, biodiversity and trees, and implications for the development of adjoining sites.</p> <p><b>Potential for reasonable alternatives</b></p> <p>Two alternative options have been identified.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Seek to prevent the loss of residential gardens except where it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be no harm to local character.</li> <li>ii. Allow for development of residential gardens in principle so long as the proposed development is consistent with the design policies of the Local Plan.</li> </ol>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 53:</b> What do you think the Local Plan should say about the development of residential gardens? In seeking to resist inappropriate development should the plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Seek to prevent the loss of residential gardens except where it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be no harm to local</li> </ol>

	<p>character.</p> <p>ii. Allow for development of residential gardens in principle so long as the proposed development is consistent with the design policies of the Local Plan.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Both options propose methods of ensuring redevelopment of residential gardens contributes to creating good spaces and enhancement of the townscape. It is assumed that other policies in the plan will address landscape and townscape issues. The first option (option i) appears to set a stronger presumption against development. This could mean additional land may be needed to accommodate the scale of development needed in the district as there could be less recycling of land within villages. It could mean less garden land is developed, which could have a positive impact for biodiversity, although this will be balanced if other land is required elsewhere to compensate.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i. Support: 42, Object: 1, Comment: 0</p> <p>ii. Support: 19, Object: 11, Comment: 1</p> <p>Please provide any comments: 12</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>Question 53i</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 13 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• There should be a minimum size below which land can't be subdivided. Developments should only be allowed where the new dwelling is for the use of the owner or their family. Householders wishing to build one house in their garden should not be made to build many based on a density calculation</li> <li>• This should only be considered where a family wants to provide accommodation for a young member who cannot get affordable housing or an elderly dependent needing care</li> <li>• Garden grabs increase housing density, local traffic, etc, while reducing wildlife and biodiversity</li> <li>• Frequently, the result of such development is two dwellings with inadequate open space for each and overlooking problems. The onus must be for applicants to demonstrate conclusively that there is no harm to the character of the surroundings nor neighbour enjoyment</li> <li>• Unrestricted development can lead to a loss of medium and large trees in village gardens</li> <li>• The existing policy, to prevent loss of residential gardens, seems to be consistent with the overall aim of preserving the existing character of villages and reducing/limiting the population overload of this area</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would seriously frustrate the delivery of windfall development opportunities</li> <li>• Replacement of existing dwellings and re-use of existing</li> </ul>

	<p>buildings within village frameworks should be allowed, but not increased density and building on gardens</p> <p><b>Question 53ii</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The construction of dwellings in large gardens can assist in meeting the housing requirement without compromising amenity. A formal policy to allow such development would, in the terms of para 48 of the NPPF 'provide a reliable source of supply' which would form part of the 'windfall' allowance in the 5-year supply. Development should be subject to the normal development control criteria relating to overlooking, visual impact, etc.</li> <li>• Cambridgeshire County Council - Support the wording of (ii) that in seeking to resist inappropriate development the plan should allow for development of residential gardens in principle so long as the proposed development is consistent with the design policies of the Local Plan. The NPPF supports a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that the default position should be 'yes' to development subject to the satisfaction of all other material considerations. Accordingly, policy should be written with a positive approach but appropriately caveated</li> <li>• Support from 6 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• The Local Plan should allow the development of some residential gardens but not to the detriment of the local visual appearance. It is also to be born in mind that some larger gardens are greatly beneficial to wildlife diversity</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of residential gardens has the undesirable effect of pushing up the price of houses with large gardens. People who want space for their children to play in have to compete with developers looking to make a profit by dividing the land</li> <li>• Replacement of existing dwellings and re-use of existing buildings within village frameworks should be allowed, but not increased density and building on gardens</li> </ul>
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Include a policy to protect residential gardens from development except where there would be no significant harm to the local area. Consultation responses clearly favour a policy with a protective stance rather than one which takes a more permissive approach, but all are concerned to ensure that there should be no significant harm to the local area including residential amenities.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personal family circumstances can always be taken into account as a material consideration when planning applications are being considered.</li> <li>• Including a minimum size threshold for subdivisions would be arbitrary and ignore individual site circumstances.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new density policy allows local character and site circumstances to be taken into account.</li> <li>• Existing trees on site can be protected as part of the development process.</li> <li>• Large plots will always cost more and will command a hope value irrespective of Local plan Policy wordings which are subject to regular review.</li> </ul>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/15: Development of Residential Gardens

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 54</b>	<b>Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside</b>
Key evidence	N/A
Existing policies	Policy HG/8 Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential use
Analysis	<p>South Cambridgeshire has a rich heritage of agricultural buildings which are no longer needed for agricultural purposes. The policy in the previous plan was to prioritise their future use for employment purposes and only exceptionally for residential conversion in order to concentrate housing development within our larger villages where residents would have better access to services, facilities and public transport.</p> <p>However the NPPF has changed Government planning policy to be less restrictive stating that Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside; or</li> <li>• Where the development would be the best viable use of a heritage asset or would otherwise help to secure the future of heritage assets; or</li> <li>• Where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Potential for reasonable alternatives</b></p> <p>Two alternative options have been identified.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not include a specific policy and rely on that in the NPPF.</li> <li>Include a policy based on the NPPF taking account of local circumstances, setting out the factors that would be taken into account, including whether the building is disused or redundant, the degree of reconstruction required, the need for extensions, their scale and impact, and scope for enhancement of setting.</li> </ol>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area,

	<p>and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 54:</b> How do you think the Local Plan should address reuse of buildings in the countryside?</p> <p>i) Not include a policy on the re-use of buildings in the countryside for residential use?</p> <p>ii) Include a policy on the re-use of buildings in the countryside for residential use setting out what factors would be taken into account.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Having a specific policy (option ii) may create greater certainty that impact on landscape and townscape would be taken into account. Enabling reuse for residential could impact on availability of such buildings for employment uses. A policy could provide greater certainty regarding the circumstances when a residential use will be acceptable. A policy could also consider wider issues, including access to services and facilities, and transport.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i. Support: 4, Object: 1, Comment: 0</p> <p>ii. Support: 56, Object: 1, Comment: 3</p> <p>Please provide any comments: 6</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>Question 54i</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support option i Such a policy would need to be in conformity with the NPPF and it is difficult to see what option ii would add</li> <li>• The re-use of buildings in the countryside is key to maintaining sustainable communities. Whilst scope exists for a policy, the NPPF deals with this issue and advises clearly that residential uses can be deemed acceptable. Reliance on the NPPF would be adequate</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unrestricted conversion of properties to residential use could lead to unsuitable developments</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 54ii</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 22 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• Rural buildings in the Open Countryside can offer the opportunity to create attractive and innovative dwellings and if designed correctly, can maintain and enhance the rural character of an</li> </ul>

	<p>area. Whilst in some locations business use is a viable alternative to residential for rural buildings, increased traffic generation and issues of neighbour amenity often make this unsatisfactory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a building is to be allowed to fall down as it no longer has any use for employment, it is clearly more sensible that it should be converted into a dwelling or dwellings. This must be done taking into account clear design and local character.</li> <li>• Policy should cover the re-use of such properties for any purpose</li> <li>• Better option as it sets out what factors would be taken into account when discussing these types of conversions</li> <li>• In some situations a residential use is the only viable option for retaining heritage assets and locally important buildings</li> <li>• Some rural buildings have been converted into offices which cannot be let in the current economic climate, whereas they would provide suitable housing for young families</li> <li>• Isolated housing or employment - excluding for farming - should be avoided. Journeys to and from such isolated developments are by car. They are visually intrusive, and inappropriate amongst open fields.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The circumstances of rural buildings, their suitability for continued use, the value of the structures, the harm in their conversion, or indeed replacement, for alternative uses are non generic and as such the greatest flexibility should be retained to ensure the Local Plan does not unnecessarily prescribe criteria that only fit certain circumstances. Therefore applications should be judged on their individual circumstances, merits and impacts, and this flexibility is best achieved by allowing direct interpretation of the NPPF by the applicant and case officers</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This should only be if the business use is not viable in accordance with other policies contained in the Local Plan</li> <li>• Re-use of agricultural buildings for business use is preferable as commuting by car is likely to be in the opposite direction to commuting from rural houses and therefore causes less congestion.</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	Include a policy permitting the use and adaptation of redundant or disused buildings in rural areas for residential use subject to relevant criteria including a prioritisation for future employment use There is strong support for the inclusion of such a policy with objections that we could rely on the policy guidance in the NPPF, and that such development would be unsustainable and employment uses preferred.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/16: Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 55</b>	<b>Working at Home</b>
Key evidence	Labour Force Surveys
Existing policies	Policy HG/8 (section 5)
Analysis	<p>A growing number of people are working at home either full time or part time and in self-employment or as an alternative to going into the office. Home working can help to maintain economic prosperity and employment and relive commuting pressure on our roads, and can be expected to grow further as rural broadband speeds increase. The policies of the Local Plan can help or hinder this growth. Normally the use of part of an existing dwelling for homeworking will not require planning permission being ancillary to the main residential use. The level of demand for new purpose built properties designed to enable a wide range of home working may have been held back by the lack of a specific plan policy to encourage such provision.</p> <p>Analysis of data from the UK Labour Force Survey shows a continued rise in the number of people working mainly from home. At the end of 2009, 12.8% of the workforce (3.7 million people) worked mainly at or from home. This is a 21% increase since 2001. The region with the highest level of homeworking is the South West, at 15.6%, followed by the South East (15.2%) and the East of England (14%). Homeworking is more prevalent in rural areas in the UK. At the end of 2009, 18.88% of the rural workforce was working at/from home, compared to 11.24% of the urban workforce. The proportion of rural workers who are self-employed homeworkers is 12.24%, almost double the urban figure of 6.75%. At least two-thirds of rural homeworkers are self-employed. However, the number of employees who work part of the time from home is now at around the 20% mark. Future growth is expected as more employees work part-time from home, and some who now work part-time increase the number of days they spend away from the office.</p> <p><b>Potential for reasonable alternatives</b></p> <p>The Local Plan could not include a specific policy on the issue and rely on other plan policies and the policy of the NPPF that where a plan is silent on an issue grant planning permission unless the adverse impacts of doing so would outweigh the benefits of the development. Alternatively it could include a policy on working at home stating that proposals will be approved unless there would be an effective loss of residential use, or there would be unacceptable impacts on factors such as residential amenity, local character, heritage assets, and traffic and parking.</p>
Which objectives	Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South

does this issue or policy address?	Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 55:</b> What approach should the Local Plan take to working at home?</p> <p>i) Not include a policy on working at home and rely on the other policies of the Local Plan and the NPPF to consider proposals.</p> <p>ii) Include a policy on working at home stating that proposals will be approved unless there would be an effective loss of residential use, or there would be unacceptable impacts on factors such as residential amenity, local character, heritage assets, and traffic and parking.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Both options propose different ways of supporting home working. Home working could reduce the need to travel, supporting achievement of the sustainable travel objective. It is difficult to differentiate impacts, but having a policy (option ii) may create additional certainty that negative impacts would be considered.
Representations Received	<p>i. Support: 11, Object: 0, Comment: 0</p> <p>ii. Support: 34, Object: 2, Comment: 3</p> <p>Please provide any comments: 6</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>Question 55i</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 4 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• Support option i) Much home working is invisible and need not concern planning policy</li> <li>• People will work from home anyway, provided broadband provision is adequate. Internet based business does not have the same planning implications as business use in the past</li> <li>• Home working is already well developed locally without any specific policy. Unless this has now become impossible to administer it would be better to do nothing rather than deliberately create a new category of semi-home, semi-workplace.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 55ii</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridgeshire County Council - Working from home is increasing year on year as new technology advances to allow people both self employed and employees to work from home. Within the rural areas effective home working will be significantly assisted by the introduction of better Broadband capacity</li> <li>• Support from 18 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• It is important to support people working at home because they reduce the congestion on the roads</li> <li>• Working at home is an increasingly sustainable option to reduce commuting, and often provides the first step in setting up small businesses with little or no impact on the local community.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The community is strengthened by home workers introducing a wider age group in the village during the daytime supporting shops, pubs, post offices and other local services ie accountants</li> <li>• Strict limits on anything more than self-employment and visitors</li> <li>• Home offices and live/work units are important to getting new businesses off the ground and fostering economic development. Unless there would be an impact upon amenity, there should be active support for such developments. This policy should form part of the Council's more positive approach to economic development as required by the NPPF</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am worried that a statement that "home-working" could lead to a wide variety of inappropriate industries being set up in residential areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loss of residential use is usually temporary. It should not be allowed too much weight</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	Include a policy that would permit working at home subject to specified criteria being considered. There was strong support for such a policy. The few objections were primarily concerned with avoiding harm to residential amenity.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/17: Working at Home

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 56</b>	<b>Countryside Dwellings of Exceptional Quality</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2010-2015</li> <li>• Cambridge Cluster at 50 (Final report to EEDA March 2011)</li> <li>• NPPF</li> </ul>
Existing policies	N/A
Analysis	There is some evidence of an unfulfilled demand for large high quality homes in the £1 million plus category suitable for business executives. The development of such homes in the district could have been constrained by policy HG/7 on replacement dwellings in the countryside which limits volume increases to 15% of the original and by other policies which seek to prevent the construction of isolated homes in the countryside. The lack of such homes could have had some impact on economic growth if it has affected executive recruitment. The NPPF includes policy guidance to avoid the construction of isolated country homes which may be suitable for such executives unless there are special circumstances such as the exceptional quality and innovative nature of the design, that it enhance its immediate setting and that it is sensitive to the defining

	<p>characteristics of the local area. A number of reasonable options have been put forward for consideration and comment to address these issues.</p> <p><b>Potential for reasonable alternatives</b></p> <p>Two alternative options have been identified. To rely on the Local Plan policies concerning design and replacement houses in the countryside and the NPPF, to control such proposals, or alternatively to introduce a new policy on the issue in the plan, with criteria based upon the NPPF guidance and taking into account local circumstances.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 56:</b> What approach should the Local Plan take to new countryside homes of exceptional quality?</p> <p>i) Not include such a policy.</p> <p>ii) Include a policy on exceptional homes in the countryside.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Both options propose different ways of addressing proposals for countryside dwellings of exceptional quality. It is difficult to differentiate impacts, but having a policy (option ii) may create additional certainty. Enabling executive homes has been noted in studies of the local economy as necessary to support economic growth, but it will also create dwellings in less accessible locations which would have a negative impact on achieving sustainable transport. Impact on landscape and townscape would also need to be a key consideration in the design process.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i. Support: 19, Object: 1, Comment: 0</p> <p>ii. Support: 21, Object: 3, Comment: 2</p> <p>Please provide any comments: 7</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>Question 56i</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support from 8 Parish Councils.</li> </ul>

- A specific policy on dwellings of exceptional quality in the countryside should not be needed, all applications should be judged on their merits and therefore the national policy planning framework will suffice.
- Planning rules should apply to all properties, whatever the size/cost.
- There are many expensive big houses for sale in the District without encouraging more.
- The idea that those who are already earning far more than the average should be granted special permission to build enormous mansions where others on normal salaries cannot afford to buy even a small house is repugnant.
- Greenfield sites should be released only when there is a recognised local need for new housing.

**OBJECTIONS:**

- A new policy should be included. It should go beyond the national policy. National policy effectively requires the home to be built in the modernist style. There are many people who want to build country houses in traditional styles that do not meet the criterion for them to be 'innovative', and a local policy should make allowances for that.

**Question 56ii**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support from 8 Parish Councils.
- Provides the opportunity to employ innovative approaches to the reuse of redundant sites in the rural area such as former pig and poultry units. The policy should be focussed on either exception design, improvement to an area, or relation to existing settlements. We believe that it is important for the local economy to retain high earning employees within the District
- It is important to upscale the working population for economic growth. Large homes look good and do not demand much on the infrastructure
- Where there is a demand, then they should be built. Surely economic growth for the area would presume that such houses would be needed as part of that growth. Not providing such houses would mean more commuting and cause an impact on transport.

**OBJECTIONS:**

- The criteria "exceptional" will not be workable; all proposed developments should fall under the same policies
- Include a strongly worded policy against "Top executive homes". These are inappropriate eyesores, often sited to be as visible as possible in open country, serviced by Chelsea tractors and encouraging social division. There are plenty of large, expensive

	<p>houses with big gardens in Cambridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I see absolutely no reason why those on exceptionally large incomes should be given a mechanism to bypass the ordinary restrictions affecting the building of new houses</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy to permit countryside dwellings of exceptional quality providing specified criteria are met. There was strong support for the inclusion of such a policy, the few objections received were concerned with countryside impact, difficulty of application and the social divisiveness of allowing development as an exception to the normal operation of countryside protection policies.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The NPPF does not require all such developments to be innovative.</li> <li>• There is no reason to believe that the policy would be a Trojan horse for unrestricted countryside development. The number of such homes completed nationally since the introduction of guidance in 1997 is around 25 and only around 50 have received planning permission.</li> </ul>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/14: Countryside Dwellings of Exceptional Quality

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 57i</b>	<b>Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 (plus consideration by the South Cambridgeshire Housing Portfolio Holder Meeting 13.6.12)</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller Community Strategy 2010-2013</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller DPD consultation documents and public consultation responses</li> <li>• Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – Good Practice Guide (CLG 2008)</li> <li>• Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011</li> <li>• Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (CLG 2012)</li> </ul>
Existing policies	
Analysis	<p>National planning policy requires local planning authorities to plan for the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople through the plan making process, in a similar way to how it would plan to meet other housing needs. Where there is an unmet need, Local Plans have to identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of pitches against their locally set targets, and identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years six to ten and, where possible, for years 11-15.</p> <p>When the Council started work on its Gypsy and Traveller DPD,</p>

regional plans were being prepared that would set targets for the number of pitches to be delivered. The East of England plan (adopted in July 2009) determined that all districts should deliver sites, and that some of the need identified in areas with the highest levels of existing provision, like South Cambridgeshire, should be met by surrounding areas with lower levels of provision, in order to aid choice, provide greater equity between districts, and speed up delivery. New government guidance published in March 2012 advises that Local Planning Authorities should set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in their area, working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities.

To help inform the development of a local target, the Council joined forces with other local authorities in Cambridgeshire, as well as parts of Norfolk and Suffolk, to commission an update of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment that was last completed in 2006.

*Future Gypsy and Traveller need in South Cambridgeshire (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011, as modified following further consideration by the Housing Portfolio Holder meeting 13.6.12)*

<b>Period</b>	<b>Pitches</b>
2011 - 2016	65
2016 - 2021	0
2021 - 2026	20
2026 - 2031	0
<b>TOTAL 2011 to 2031</b>	<b>85</b>

The backlog of need identified in the first period are primarily from households resident in South Cambridgeshire on sites that only have temporary planning permission or are on unauthorised sites, and require permanent accommodation.

Future need from population growth fluctuates reflecting the population data. The study notes that beyond the immediate need, assessments of growth are based on modelling, and the best information available. The difficulties in protecting forward beyond 10 years, are noted in national guidance regarding carrying out needs assessments. However, for plan making purposes we need to plan ahead at least 15 years from adoption of the plan. There will be a need to monitor the plan and review it as necessary to take account of more up to date evidence. A further option is that the Council could seek for some of the need to be met outside the district. This approach was found reasonable by the East of England Plan, which determined that some of the need from areas of the highest existing

provision like South Cambridgeshire should be met in surrounding areas with lower levels of existing provision.

The base date for the accommodation needs assessment is January 2011. Since January 2011, 9 pitches have gained planning permission and been completed and occupied. These include a site at Rose and Crown Road, Swavesey which had temporary planning permission but now has permanent planning permission. In addition, a site at Chesterton Fen Road, on land identified for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the Local Plan 2004, is under construction at time of writing. These pitches will contribute to meeting the selected target, therefore reducing the number of pitches needed by 35.

*New Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision since January 2011*

Address	Number of Pitches	Delivery
Southgate Farm, Chesterton Fen Road, Milton	26	Under Construction
Blackwell Site, Milton	1	Under Construction
Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey	8	Complete
<b>TOTAL NEW PERMANENT PITCHES AFTER JANUARY 2011</b>	<b>35</b>	

On the basis of a target of 85 pitches to 2031 of which 60 need to be provided in the period 2011 to 2016, and a provision so far of 35, sites to provide 25 pitches need to be identified in the Local Plan for the period to 2016, and broad locations identified for the remaining plan period if specific sites cannot be identified.

The two rounds of Issues and Options consultation already undertaken on the Gypsy and Traveller DPD will be used to inform the site allocations to be included in the submission draft Local Plan and so are not subject to further consultation in this Local Plan consultation. In the same way reliance will be placed on the outcome of previous consultations regarding the criteria to be used to guide land supply allocations, the criteria to be taken into account when windfall sites come forward and on the design of new sites.

This plan also needs to address planning issues regarding **Travelling Showpeople** sites. Travelling Showpeople are self-employed business people that, because of their distinctive lifestyle, form a close-knit community with a distinctive culture. A feature of this culture is the importance placed on extended family links often

reinforced by family business ties. Sites were often referred to as 'winter quarters', although as the types of employment are changing they may be used at other times of the year. They need secure, permanent bases for the storage of equipment when not in use. Most Showpeople need to live alongside their equipment, so sites must be suitable for both residential and business use.

The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 considered the distinctive needs of this group. There are two existing sites in South Cambridgeshire, both at Meldreth, one site is permitted to accommodate up to 10 plots, and one of up to 11 plots. There are no unauthorised or temporary sites. The Assessment identified a need for 4 plots up to 2016. Given the low numbers involved, the study identified the difficulties in assessing longer-term needs accurately. Reflecting longer term growth rates advocated by the Showman Guild and used in the East of England Plan (1.5% per annum) would indicate a need of 1 to 2 plots per five years period beyond 2016. Evidence of longer term need will be kept under review over the plan period.

In the previous consultation views were sought on the potential for an additional six plots within the existing Biddles Boulevard site in Meldreth. The outcome of previous consultation will be taken into account in the preparation of the submission draft Local Plan and are not repeated in this consultation.

The numbers of plots needed is very low, and over a long period. There is uncertainty over whether this will generate a need for a new site in the district in the longer term, or need could be met on existing sites. It is therefore proposed to rely on additional provision coming forward as windfalls over the period of the plan for the longer term. As for the Gypsy and Traveller pitches, there will be opportunities to review and monitor the plan over the period to see how need develops.

**Potential for reasonable alternatives:**

- i. Four reasonable alternatives have been identified. Set a target to provide 85 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller occupation over the period to 2031, which means we need to provide an additional 30 permanent pitches by 2016, and a total of 50 pitches over the period 2011 to 2031.
- ii. Either set a target for Travelling Showpeople of 4 plots to 2016 and an additional 3 to 6 plots to 2031, or rely on an additional windfall site coming forward to meet this need over the plan period.
- iii. Explore with adjoining local planning authorities the extent to which local needs can be met in adjoining districts.

	<p>iv. Include a policy that requires that site provision be made for Gypsy and Traveller occupation in all new settlements, and other allocated and windfall developments of at least 500 new homes. Any land not needed during the plan period to 2031 to be safeguarded for occupation after the plan period.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 57:</b> What approach should the Local Plan take to the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?</p> <p>i) Set a target to provide 85 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller occupation over the period to 2031, which means we would need to provide an additional 50 permanent pitches by 2031.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Meeting the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, as identified in needs assessments, would contribute significantly to the objective of ensuring that everyone has access to decent homes, and redressing inequalities. Enabling provision of accommodation will also support achievement of the human health objective, and access to employment. Relying on windfalls for travelling Showpeople accommodation (option ii) would create less certainty.</p> <p>Due to high numbers of existing pitches in the district and low numbers in some surrounding areas, delivery of some pitches in surrounding areas (option iii) could provide greater equity, and choice for the travelling community. It could also mean needs are met further from where they were identified, or deliver greater uncertainty.</p> <p>Delivery of pitches in association with major developments (option iv) mean they are delivered in accessible locations (subject to site selection), and could further help redress inequalities by supporting community interaction.</p>
Representations Received	Support: 11, Object: 10, Comment: 3
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to explain how the figure of 85 was arrived upon which varies from original Needs Assessment;</li> <li>• Need to split need figure into needs of specific groups, such as Irish Travellers.</li> <li>• Support from 7 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• Care must be taken on the infrastructure to ensure appropriate facilities, water, sewage etc.</li> <li>• Any policy should not appear to discriminate against the settled community</li> </ul>

**OBJECTIONS:**

- The concentration of pitches in the East of England is disproportionate.
- Full needs of other groups not met be plan e.g. affordable housing.
- Should not include a target.
- Should make provision outside the district.
- Objection from 2 Parish Councils.
- Accommodation Needs Assessment underestimates need in the area. Assumptions are optimistic. High demand for rental plots.
- The Assessment was carried out by the local authorities themselves as an internal technical exercise. It was reported only to politicians, ignoring strong guidance for involving the wider community and specifically the Gypsy and Traveller communities
- The process of agreeing the projections has ignored the guidance at paragraph 6 of Planning policy for travellers and in the DCLG guidance note on carrying out assessments on the importance of engaging the traveller communities in their development. There is a strong risk the assessment will not provide a robust basis for the preparation of development plans
- In the 2011 GT Sub-region Needs Assessment, the turnover of pitches on public sites is the only part of the model which takes account of movement between bricks & mortar housing and caravans. Our experience is that a significant part of the demand for new pitches is from Gypsies & Travellers moving from bricks & mortar into private sites. We consider the numbers seriously underestimate the numbers involved. Since despite strong guidance there was no consultation with either the wider community or Gypsies and Travellers, we have no confidence in the statements of need
- A specific objective for the plan should to be provide good quality secure accommodation principally for the Irish Traveller community, either on a new site, with the removal of the threat of further injunctions and upgrading of Smithy Fen on a temporary basis, or by accepting and supporting the upgrading of Smithy Fen
- As South Cambridgeshire has failed to meet their identified need through the RSS pitches must be provided. To allocate sites such as Site 094 as identified through the SHLAA 2012 process would make a significant contribution towards meeting need;
- We are very concerned that while Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Council have been successful in securing £1m of funding from the Homes and Communities Agency, they have yet to identify any 'acceptable' land for pitches in either area despite the fact that they continue to refuse planning permission for permanent sites for Irish Travellers at Smithy Fen and provide for clear unmet needs for sites in our area. We wonder what purpose was served by bidding for HCA funding and whether Cambridge City will be returning the money

	<p>received?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The desk-based arithmetic modelling in the 2011 GTAA approach is highly dependent on assumptions which do not reflect the evidence and our knowledge of the Gypsy and Traveller communities. We dispute the 40% reduction in unauthorised (caravan) need, unreliable counts for caravans on unauthorised sites or encampments, overcrowding on private pitches and the demand for pitches by G&amp;Ts wishing to move out of bricks &amp; mortar into private sites. Discounting need shows a complete misunderstanding of the culture and way of life of this group. Travellers choose to live in large extended family groups not in arbitrarily designated sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore with the people themselves whether iii would be suitable. Presumably Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople have a desire to live in South Cambridgeshire when they are not travelling</li> <li>Providing an additional 50 permanent pitches by 2031 is undeliverable</li> </ul>
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Identify a provision target of 85 pitches between 2011 and 2031.</p> <p>The Government's Planning Policy for Travellers Sites requires the Council to include a target in the Local Plan. They are also required to identify how target will be addressed. A number of representations consider that the target is too high, and others consider a target is too low. The Cambridge Sub Region Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment was commissioned in partnership with nine other local authorities in Cambridgeshire, as well as parts of Norfolk and Suffolk. The methodology agreed with a wide range of input, including evidence from Travellers Liaison Officers across the area, and is considered an effective method of assessing need across the wider area.</p> <p>The Needs Assessment utilised data gathered in recent surveys and well as statistical and other sources of information. It used information from existing local primary and secondary sources, including the number of young people of family forming age, and unauthorized caravans recorded in the caravan counts. The assessment built on research carried out in 2006 for the previous assessment. The previous survey was comparatively comprehensive and provided considerable information which has either not changed significantly, or any change can be measured without repeating the survey. The reasons for this approach are established in appendix 1 of the Needs Assessment.</p> <p>As recommended in Government Guidance on completing Needs Assessments the process involved in conducting the assessment has been transparent, with clearly documented evidence included in</p>

the study of assumptions made, and decisions taken.

One representation specifically queries element of the data used in the needs assessment. Data is gathered in biannual caravan counts carried out by Council Officers, and is considered a reasonable snapshot of occupation at that time. The level of unauthorised caravans in the district has dropped significantly in recent years, from over 300 in 2005, to around 10 in 2012. This is as a result of a combination of factors, including authorising additional sites (including temporary planning permissions), and enforcement action. The movement of Gypsies and Travellers was considered in the Needs Assessment. Evidence suggested that movement was taking place in both directions, which were likely to be equal in measure.

The Needs Assessment was reported at a public meeting the Council's Housing Portfolio Holder, after being subject to an internal review. This concluded that assumptions regarding turnover had not been correctly applied, which impacted on the estimation of future need. The correction reduced the need from 47 to 20 (This is documented in the reports to the Housing portfolio holder meeting 13 June 2012).

The Needs Assessment provides an appropriate assessment of need in the short term, and an estimation of need in the longer term. As required by the Housing Act, the Council will continue to monitor the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers, and changes can be addressed in future reviews of the Local Plan.

With regard to specific sites referred to in representations, additional development at Smithy Fen was considered through the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document Issues and Options 2 process, and rejected, for reasons including adverse impact on the countryside, and the scale of site. It does not warrant further consideration. SHLAA site 94 (east of Chesterton Fen Road) was reviewed, but is not considered a reasonable option due to impact on the Green Belt and the consolidation of development on the east side of Chesterton Fen Road.

The proposed policy has not differentiated whether any sites should be allocated for a particular ethnic group within the Gypsy and Traveller community and this is not appropriate or possible to do so through the planning process, which identifies sites as suitable for travellers, as defined in Government policy.

The District Council in partnership with Cambridge City Council has secured £500k to deliver Gypsy and Traveller site provision from the HCA. The time limit for utilising the funding expires before the anticipated adoption of the Local Plan. The Councils are therefore been exploring other deliverable site options outside the plan making

	<p>process.</p> <p>Additionally, to ensure that the levels of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation are maintained, sites are safeguarded to meet the continuing housing needs of these communities. Safeguarding will ensure that sites are not lost to competing uses. This could be a particular issue in Chesterton Fen Road where major developments are taking place close by. Unrestricted means not subject to conditions restricting the time of occupancy such as a temporary or personal planning permission.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	<p>Policy S/5: Provision of Jobs and Homes</p> <p>Policy H/19: Provision for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</p>

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 57ii</b>	<b>Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 (plus consideration by the South Cambridgeshire Housing Portfolio Holder Meeting 13.6.12)</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller Community Strategy 2010-2013</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller DPD consultation documents and public consultation responses</li> <li>• Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – Good Practice Guide (CLG 2008)</li> <li>• Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011</li> <li>• Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (CLG 2012)</li> </ul>
Existing policies	
Analysis	As above – see Issues and Options 2012 Issue 57i.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 57:</b> What approach should the Local Plan take to the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?</p> <p>ii) Not set a target for Travelling Showpeople occupation and rely on an additional windfall site coming forward over the plan period.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Meeting the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, as identified in needs assessments, would contribute significantly to the objective of ensuring that everyone has access to decent homes, and redressing inequalities. Enabling provision of accommodation will also support achievement of the human health objective, and access to employment. Relying on windfalls for travelling Showpeople accommodation (option ii) would create less certainty.</p> <p>Due to high numbers of existing pitches in the district and low</p>

	<p>numbers in some surrounding areas, delivery of some pitches in surrounding areas (option iii) could provide greater equity, and choice for the travelling community. It could also mean needs are met further from where they were identified, or deliver greater uncertainty.</p> <p>Delivery of pitches in association with major developments (option iv) mean they are delivered in accessible locations (subject to site selection), and could further help redress inequalities by supporting community interaction.</p>
Representations Received	Support: 10, Object: 2, Comment: 4
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 8 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• The demand for new sites is likely to be very low.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A target should be set for Travelling Show-people no matter how low the current need</li> <li>• This is potentially contrary to Government policy. If there is a need, site provision should be made to meet it</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need to set a specific target due to the low level of need identified</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Identify the short term need of 4 plots 2011 to 2016 in policy, but rely on windfall sites to meet future need.</p> <p>The Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 identified a need for 4 additional plots between 2011 and 2016 in the district. In order to meet the requirements of Government Policy, this should be referenced in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Identifying need over the longer term is more difficult, particularly due to the very low numbers involved. It is not considered appropriate to include a target for the longer term. The figure can be updated through future reviews of the needs assessment.</p> <p>An existing site was identified at Meldreth through the Issues and Options 2 which could potentially accommodate additional plots. This is currently the subject of a planning application.</p> <p>A suitable policy has been included to enable the consideration of windfall site proposals. This is considered the most appropriate approach for the district rather than identifying a specific site.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	<p>Policy H/19: Provision for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</p> <p>Policy H/21: Proposals for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling</p>

	Showpeople Sites on Unallocated Land Outside Development Frameworks Policy H/22: Design of Gypsy and Traveller Sites, and Travelling Showpeople Sites
--	--

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 57iii</b>	<b>Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 (plus consideration by the South Cambridgeshire Housing Portfolio Holder Meeting 13.6.12)</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller Community Strategy 2010-2013</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller DPD consultation documents and public consultation responses</li> <li>• Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – Good Practice Guide (CLG 2008)</li> <li>• Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011</li> <li>• Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (CLG 2012)</li> </ul>
Existing policies	
Analysis	As above – see Issues and Options 2012 Issue 57i.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 57:</b> What approach should the Local Plan take to the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?</p> <p>iii) Explore with adjoining local planning authorities the extent to which local needs can be met in adjoining districts.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Meeting the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, as identified in needs assessments, would contribute significantly to the objective of ensuring that everyone has access to decent homes, and redressing inequalities. Enabling provision of accommodation will also support achievement of the human health objective, and access to employment. Relying on windfalls for travelling Showpeople accommodation (option ii) would create less certainty.</p> <p>Due to high numbers of existing pitches in the district and low numbers in some surrounding areas, delivery of some pitches in surrounding areas (option iii) could provide greater equity, and choice for the travelling community. It could also mean needs are met further from where they were identified, or deliver greater uncertainty.</p> <p>Delivery of pitches in association with major developments (option iv) mean they are delivered in accessible locations (subject to site selection), and could further help redress inequalities by supporting community interaction.</p>

Representations Received	Support: 27, Object: 4, Comment: 1
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support form 10 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Should explore with adjoining local planning authorities the extent to which actual local needs can be met in adjoining districts</li> <li>• Traveller provision - detailed assessment needed on sites on City/S Cambs fringe to provide suitable site and also reduce reliance on wider South Cambs</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council - The City Council would welcome the opportunity to continue working with South Cambridgeshire on this issue, including consideration of pitch provision on the borders of Cambridge. However, in addition to the provision of permanent pitches in South Cambridgeshire, reference needs to be made to the need for transit pitches and emergency stopping places. The City Council would like to work with South Cambridgeshire District Council to achieve transit pitches and emergency stopping places in suitable locations</li> <li>• As the name suggests Traveller issues need to be addressed by more than one authority to get the best solution for all concerned, and such authorities may have more sustainable sites</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not for us. We have always lived near Cambridge</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire has a specific need to accommodate Gypsy and Traveller pitches due to historic under provision. To seek to "push" the identified need to an adjoining authority is not equitable, does not deal with the locational need for pitches to be in certain areas for historic and community reasons, the need to avoid significant clusters of pitches in certain areas and as a consequence a significant void elsewhere and the specific needs of this defined transient population to be accommodated near to their employment and social circles is unacceptable</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This needs to be done in the right way. On the one hand, districts like Huntingdonshire have limited need because of past resistance to provision. It is important that Gypsies and Travellers are free to live in all areas. On the other, behind this policy, is the sense that South Cambs has too many Travellers and they should be accommodated elsewhere. It should reflect embracing and welcoming the District's Gypsies and Travellers and supporting provision for their needs reflecting where they want to live, and existing patterns of settlement and school attendance</li> <li>• St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Given that the identified need in St Edmundsbury is significantly lower than South</li> </ul>

	<p>Cambridgeshire, the Borough Council is unlikely to support an approach in which some of the South Cambridgeshire's locally identified need is provided for in St Edmundsbury. It is considered that this approach would potentially be directing people to where they do not want or need to live. It is also considered important to make provision for transit sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific Transit site for 6 caravans should be provided near Addenbrooke`s Hospital</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Although Councils will be responsible for setting their own development targets, as part of the replacement for regional planning the government is proposing to introduce a 'duty to cooperate', which will require Councils to work together on strategic issues which affect a wider than district area.</p> <p>The Council co-operated with surrounding Districts to produce the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment and identify the level of need. On balance given the nature of the need, and the options available to meet it, it is considered that the target for the District should currently reflect the full level of need. This approach has also been applied in surrounding districts.</p> <p>The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 explores issues regarding need for transit provision in the area. Evidence regarding the need for a site is uncertain. Evidence of historic demand for transit use directly in South Cambridgeshire is limited. The number of unauthorised roadside encampments is actually very low. They are also generally small, and only last a few days. Such sites can be costly to manage, and often end up being occupied permanently. The council will continue to work with Cambridge City to explore the issue, and consider the need to identify emergency stopping places.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/19: Provision for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 57iv</b>	<b>Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 (plus consideration by the South Cambridgeshire Housing Portfolio Holder Meeting 13.6.12)</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller Community Strategy 2010-2013</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller DPD consultation documents and public consultation responses</li> <li>• Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – Good Practice Guide (CLG 2008)</li> <li>• Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011</li> <li>• Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (CLG 2012)</li> </ul>

Existing policies	
Analysis	As above – see Issues and Options 2012 Issue 57i.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 57:</b> What approach should the Local Plan take to the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?</p> <p>iv) The Local Plan require that site provision be made for Gypsy and Traveller occupation in all new settlements, and other allocated and windfall developments of at least 500 new homes.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Meeting the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, as identified in needs assessments, would contribute significantly to the objective of ensuring that everyone has access to decent homes, and redressing inequalities. Enabling provision of accommodation will also support achievement of the human health objective, and access to employment. Relying on windfalls for travelling Showpeople accommodation (option ii) would create less certainty.</p> <p>Due to high numbers of existing pitches in the district and low numbers in some surrounding areas, delivery of some pitches in surrounding areas (option iii) could provide greater equity, and choice for the travelling community. It could also mean needs are met further from where they were identified, or deliver greater uncertainty.</p> <p>Delivery of pitches in association with major developments (option iv) mean they are delivered in accessible locations (subject to site selection), and could further help redress inequalities by supporting community interaction.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Support: 14, Object: 10, Comment: 3 Please provide any comments: 27</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 5 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• New developments would offer the best advantage of being designed and managed in a way to provide appropriate infrastructure and should, anyway, be designed to provide for a</li> </ul>

	<p>wide social and economic demographic to form a cohesive community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This fulfils the aim of treating provision for sites as a normal part of the planning system. We will need to be resolute with developers.</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council - Cambridge City Council supports the delivery of pitches in these locations subject to impacts on the surrounding area and the proposed locations for pitches being of appropriate size and design with suitable supporting infrastructure and access.</li> <li>• Developers should be given the option of providing land elsewhere.</li> <li>• Threshold should be lowered, to 300 dwellings delivering 3 pitches.</li> <li>• This seems daring but is there any evidence that gypsy and traveller communities would be better integrated/less segregated if pitches were associated with built developments? Better access to services particularly schools for gypsy and traveller children.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there are sites that can be expanded why not do that - if gypsy and travellers want to stay closer to family or other members of their community it makes sense to allow this within reason.</li> <li>• Why should new developments bear the majority of the pitches?</li> <li>• Not all new settled developments will be suitable for traveller accommodation.</li> <li>• Existing settlements should not be ignored. If there is no second new settlement or very few new sites over 500 homes, the Northstowe area might accommodate a disproportionate number of new pitches. The previous work on Gypsy and Traveller planning documents included a wider range of issues and policies that are not currently presented as options for consultation now. In particular, a tiered assessment process was proposed. This principle must be maintained. It would be more consistent with views previously expressed by SCDC Members that a more balanced geographical spread of Gypsy and Traveller sites across the district is desired.</li> <li>• Support option iv) but not necessarily requiring the provision to be on the same site as the houses.</li> <li>• Gypsy &amp; Traveller pitches should be scattered throughout the district and not concentrated in any one or few developments. Pitches should be located on separate sites and also included as small segments of larger developments.</li> <li>• Travellers do not want to live in areas that do not provide the type of spaces they want. They do not want to be in built up areas. Using areas for travellers that are allocated for low cost homes means many fewer traditional homes being provided.</li> <li>• Whilst there is a need to ensure that large developments provide</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>balanced communities which are self sustaining and forward thinking, a blanket policy requiring Gypsy and Traveller site provision at all such developments would ignore the circumstances of each development. What is important to understand with pitch provision is the actual location required by future occupiers and precisely what the need is. Imposing pitches in areas for which there is no need will not deliver useable pitches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These pitches should not be concentrated in only new developments, rather they should be widely scattered.</li> <li>• The integration of the sites within large scale developments could lead to conflict between communities and the unfair use of services.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site provision within new settlements and major sites should be part of the policy, subject to three caveats. It must not justify delay. The shortage of accommodation and housing stress is acute. Deliverable and developable sites are needed immediately, not when the new settlements and major sites are developed. Provision within them should not be an excuse to refuse permission for appropriate development elsewhere, nor for disrupting existing patterns of settlement and school attendance. Thirdly, site provision should be a planning obligation requirement to bring more resources into site provision in the district, without being dependent on public funding.</li> <li>• There should be provision alongside all new housing developments for sites.</li> <li>• Explore with the people themselves whether iii would be suitable. Presumably Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople have a desire to live in South Cambridgeshire when they are not travelling.</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy seeking opportunities to deliver Gypsy and Traveller site provision at New Communities.</p> <p>Development of Gypsy and Traveller sites through major developments offers an opportunity to ensure those developments meet the needs of all sectors of the community. Provision can be made as part of mainstream residential development. This reflects Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites - Good Practice Guide (CLG 2008) Paragraph 3.7 – <i>‘Where possible, sites should be developed near to housing for the settled community as part of mainstream residential developments.’</i> There are examples of sites developed in urban areas, and some are referenced in the Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites guidance document.</p> <p>Making provision at new communities offers a mechanism to assist delivery, due to the ability of the scale of the development to overcome viability issues. It will also assist in mainstreaming</p>

provision for this part of the community, and the provision of sites where there is good access to services and facilities. By providing sites with good access to services, facilities and public transport this will minimise the need for car journeys. Providing pitches in a variety of locations will improve choice around the district.

There is local evidence that the Gypsy and Traveller community support the principle of provision at major developments. A survey of 95 Gypsies and Travellers in the district was undertaken in November 2008 seeking their views on a potential site at Northstowe. 91% of those interviewed considered Northstowe to be a good location for a site. There is evidence of support from the Gypsy and Traveller community through representations on the Issues and Options 2 Report, including from Friends Families and Travellers, an organisation which represents Gypsies and Travellers.

Planning obligations on development is a mechanism available to the Council to achieve delivery. Planning obligations may be used to prescribe the nature of a development necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms, for example by requiring that a certain proportion of a development is for new Gypsy and Traveller pitches. Sites could be delivered as part of the affordable housing provision of a major development. There is evidence of Registered Social Landlords who would be able to deliver Gypsy and Traveller sites. They could then be managed as public sites, or other mechanisms could be explored such as equity share or lease schemes. Sites could also be delivered as private provision, and sold or leased to Gypsies and Travellers. There are various mechanisms that could be explored at a site specific level.

In response the specific comment on the issue, delivery of sites will help the geographical spread of provision, by delivering in new areas, and where they form part of larger communities. New sites will form a relatively low proportion of the overall gypsy and traveller provision in the district.

The Gypsy and Traveller Issues and Options 2 consulted on specific major development site options. The Portfolio Holder Report which considered representations in December 2010 rejected two specific options (North West Cambridge University Site, as it was primarily to meet the needs to the University, and Cambourne 950, as development had already received planning permission). Other sites remained options. Between 5 and 20 pitches (two sites of 10) was proposed.

The Local Plan Issues and Options (2012) consultation proposed a more general approach of requiring provision from developments over 500 dwellings. On balance a more general policy has been included, where sites would be sought where there are opportunities

	through significant developments or new communities. This would allow provision to be tailored by need, and be negotiated to reflect specific opportunities.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/20: Gypsy and Traveller Provision at New Communities

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 57 (other comments)</b>	<b>Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 (plus consideration by the South Cambridgeshire Housing Portfolio Holder Meeting 13.6.12)</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller Community Strategy 2010-2013</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller DPD consultation documents and public consultation responses</li> <li>• Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – Good Practice Guide (CLG 2008)</li> <li>• Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011</li> <li>• Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (CLG 2012)</li> </ul>
Existing policies	
Analysis	As above – see Issues and Options 2012 Issue 57i.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<b>Question 57:</b> What approach should the Local Plan take to the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Meeting the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, as identified in needs assessments, would contribute significantly to the objective of ensuring that everyone has access to decent homes, and redressing inequalities. Enabling provision of accommodation will also support achievement of the human health objective, and access to employment. Relying on windfalls for travelling Showpeople accommodation (option ii) would create less certainty.</p> <p>Due to high numbers of existing pitches in the district and low</p>

	<p>numbers in some surrounding areas, delivery of some pitches in surrounding areas (option iii) could provide greater equity, and choice for the travelling community. It could also mean needs are met further from where they were identified, or deliver greater uncertainty.</p> <p>Delivery of pitches in association with major developments (option iv) mean they are delivered in accessible locations (subject to site selection), and could further help redress inequalities by supporting community interaction.</p>
Representations Received	Please provide any comments: 27
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>OTHER COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Homes and Communities Agency – Is providing resources to enable new provision across the country</li> <li>• Caldecote Parish Council - Where possible temporary traveller sites should be converted to permanent sites as local infrastructure and needs should already be in place. Given that no suitable sites have been found in recent consultations, it seems unlikely that there will be appropriate sites in existing settlements. Furthermore, because of tensions between travelling and non-travelling communities placing a travellers site within an existing settlement may result in social exclusion. Due to tensions between travelling and non-travelling communities consistent policies must be in place and adhered to, to ensure protection of both communities and to aid social inclusion.</li> <li>• Any proposals should be brought forward on the basis that location is a key criteria and that the design and merits of the individual applications are considered with the same checklist that any development is required to match, in terms of quality of design, drainage and screening etc</li> <li>• Environment Agency - Any policy developed should incorporate the requirement for any site to be served by appropriate water and waste water facilities. This inclusion is required, not only to ensure the sites are sustainable, but also to reduce the possibility of localised pollution incidents</li> <li>• Great Abington Parish Council - The creation of Gypsy and Traveller sites should be restricted to small numbers of pitches so that local communities do not feel threatened or overwhelmed by large numbers of Gypsies and Travellers</li> <li>• Huntingdonshire District Council - The issues are set out in the Issues and Options document (Issue 57) in a somewhat different manner from that set out in Huntingdonshire District Council's own Strategic Options and Policies consultation. On-going discussion between Councils is supported</li> <li>• Consultation document ignores significant deprivation of Gypsy and Traveller communities, and stress relating to accommodation</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of accommodation for Gypsies, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople should include a reference to the quality of site provision</li> <li>• The policy should address the long-standing need for adequate and unrestricted access for heavy vehicles, and the provision of mains drainage, to Chesterton Fen.</li> <li>• Travellers should be treated equally, and be able to get planning permission on their own land.</li> <li>• Waterbeach Parish Council - Smaller sites with fewer pitches are preferable to large sites</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	Many of the comments related to issues that will be addressed by a policy to enable the consideration of windfall proposals, and a policy regarding the design of sites. Policies were subject to consultation through the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document Issues and Options 2 consultation in 2009, and are explored in detail in the tables below.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/21: Proposals for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Sites on Unallocated Lane Outside Development Frameworks Policy H/22: Design of Gypsy and Traveller Sites, and Travelling Showpeople Sites

Gypsy & Traveller DPD: Issues and Options 2 (July 2009) - Option OPT12	<b>Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople - Windfall Sites</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 (plus consideration by the South Cambridgeshire Housing Portfolio Holder Meeting 13.6.12)</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller Community Strategy 2010-2013</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller DPD consultation documents and public consultation responses</li> <li>• Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – Good Practice Guide (CLG 2008)</li> <li>• Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011</li> <li>• Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (CLG 2012)</li> </ul>
Existing policies	Local Plan 2004 CNF6
Analysis	The Council is required to include a policy to address windfall sites by the Government’s Planning Policy for Travellers Sites. Criteria based policies should be fair and should facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.

	<p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	Through the Gypsy and Traveller DPD Issues and Options 2 Consultation the Council considered a criteria based policy that would address proposals for windfall sites for Gypsy and Traveller sites and Travelling Showpeople Sites.
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Meeting the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, as identified in needs assessments, would contribute significantly to the objective of ensuring that everyone has access to decent homes, and redressing inequalities. Enabling provision of accommodation will also support achievement of the human health objective, and access to employment. Relying on windfalls for travelling Showpeople accommodation (option ii) would create less certainty.</p> <p>Due to high numbers of existing pitches in the district and low numbers in some surrounding areas, delivery of some pitches in surrounding areas (option iii) could provide greater equity, and choice for the travelling community. It could also mean needs are met further from where they were identified, or deliver greater uncertainty.</p> <p>Delivery of pitches in association with major developments (option iv) mean they are delivered in accessible locations (subject to site selection), and could further help redress inequalities by supporting community interaction.</p>
Representations Received	Object: 7 Support: 9 Comment: 7 (Gypsy and Traveller DPD Issues and Options 2 Consultation)
Key Issues from Representations	A variety of comments were received on the policy, including some representations in support of the Gypsy and Traveller DPD Issues and options 2 wording. Some supported the requirement for demonstrating the need for new sites. Friends Families and Travellers considered that the policy was too complex and had too many criteria. It was too onerous to consider whether alternative sites were available elsewhere. Sites could be found in rural areas therefore the policies criteria were overly strict. It should also refer to impact on biodiversity. One representor considered that a 15-pitch site was too large to be permitted at a rural centre, and others that the criteria was too restrictive, and should be considered on a site by site basis. One representor considered that rather than a maximum site size the figures should be applied as a 'pitches per village' limit.
Preferred Approach and	Include a criteria based policy to address applications for windfall sites.

Reasons	<p>It is important that the plan includes robust, clear and positive policies for addressing applications for windfall development. Criteria proposed have been considered against the change of guidance from circular 1/2006, to the more recent Planning Policy for Travellers.</p> <p>Recent appeal decisions from around the country indicate that greater flexibility has been applied with regard to accessibility compared to the criteria included in the draft policy, with inspectors permitting sites several kilometres away from services and facilities in settlements. The proposed policy has therefore included greater flexibility.</p> <p>It would not be reasonable to include a maximum pitches per village figure, as proposals should be considered on their merits.</p> <p>Policy CNF6 of the Local Plan 2004 is currently 'saved', and identifies an area west of Chesterton Fen Road Milton where permission may be granted for private Gypsy sites to meet local need. The policy has delivered a number of pitches, but will no longer be necessary once the DPD is adopted. Any future site proposals could be considered on their merits by applying the criteria based policies for windfall development which will also be included in the plan.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/21: Proposals for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Sites on Unallocated Land Outside Development Frameworks

Gypsy & Traveller DPD: Issues and Options 2 (July 2009) - Option OPT13	<b>Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople - Site Design</b>
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller DPD consultation documents and public consultation responses</li> <li>• Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – Good Practice Guide (CLG 2008)</li> <li>• Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (CLG 2012)</li> </ul>
Existing policies	
Analysis	A design policy is needed to establish what the Council expect to see in terms of the design and layout of new sites. The policy will include criteria relating to the quality of a site and facilities that it must include in order to meet the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople communities.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area,

	<p>and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Through the Gypsy and Traveller DPD Issues and Options 2 Consultation the Council considered:</p> <p>OPTION OPT13: The GTDPD should include a policy regarding design of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites. Draft Policy GT2 provided detailed policy wording.</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Meeting the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, as identified in needs assessments, would contribute significantly to the objective of ensuring that everyone has access to decent homes, and redressing inequalities. Enabling provision of accommodation will also support achievement of the human health objective, and access to employment. Relying on windfalls for travelling Showpeople accommodation (option ii) would create less certainty.</p> <p>Due to high numbers of existing pitches in the district and low numbers in some surrounding areas, delivery of some pitches in surrounding areas (option iii) could provide greater equity, and choice for the travelling community. It could also mean needs are met further from where they were identified, or deliver greater uncertainty.</p> <p>Delivery of pitches in association with major developments (option iv) mean they are delivered in accessible locations (subject to site selection), and could further help redress inequalities by supporting community interaction.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Object: 6 Support: 3 Comment: 2 (Gypsy and Traveller DPD Issues and Options 2 Consultation)</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should be clearer regarding the different design of Travelling Showpeople sites and transit sites.</li> <li>• It should also address management of sites.</li> <li>• Friends and Families and Travellers considered that the policy reflects Government Guidance on site design which is primarily aimed at new public sites, and it would be onerous for small private sites to have to meet all the criteria. The policy should be rephrased to have regard to the guidance rather than meet every requirement.</li> <li>• It should clarify the requirements in terms of recreation provision.</li> </ul>
Preferred	<p>Include a criteria based policy to address site design.</p>

Approach and Reasons	<p>It is acknowledged that some may be onerous for small private pitches to achieve, and material considerations may apply to some applications considered through the planning application process as to why some elements could not be achieved. In particular, utility blocks are not found on all private pitches. The Government Guidance Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites is very specific, and does focus on publicly provided sites, but many of the principles will apply to all sites. Policy therefore seeks for applicants to have regard to it, rather than meet all its requirements.</p> <p>The policy establishes that conditions may be applied to planning consents, restricting commercial activities, or the size of vehicles that may be stationed on a site.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/22: Design of Gypsy and Traveller Sites, and Travelling Showpeople Sites

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 58</b>	<b>Dwellings to Support a Rural Based Enterprise</b>
Key evidence	None
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Dwelling to Support a Rural Based Enterprise (HG/9)
Analysis	<p>National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 55) states that, 'Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;...'</li> </ul> <p><b>Potential for reasonable alternatives.</b> The Local Plan could:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include a policy which sets out the circumstances in which it will be acceptable to build a new home for an employee of a rural based enterprise to help support successful rural businesses and retain a living countryside. The policy would be consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), but add additional details concerning such matters as the evidence that would be required from the applicant, any restrictions to be placed on the occupation of such dwellings and when they might be relaxed and that dwellings associated with the keeping of horses would not be appropriate.</li> <li>ii. Not include such a policy in the plan and rely on the policy in the NPPF.</li> </ol>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.

	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 58:</b> How should the Local Plan address the needs of dwellings to support rural enterprises?</p> <p>i) Include a policy which sets out the circumstances in which it will be acceptable to build a new home for an employee of a rural based enterprise.</p> <p>ii) Not include such a policy and rely upon the policy guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Both options would enable dwellings to support a rural based enterprise, thus supporting economic objectives. It is difficult to differentiate between the two options, although including a policy within the local plan (option i) may create greater certainty that impacts will be fully addressed.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i. Support: 24, Object: 2, Comment: 3  ii. Support: 12, Object: 1, Comment: 0  Please provide any comments: 4</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>Question 58i</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 7 Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council.</li> <li>• This is line with the character and history of the region, and the needs of rural enterprises should be supported.</li> <li>• A policy additional to the NPPF is required to ensure positive management of the countryside and in particular the Green Belt and edges of cities and towns, where demand for countryside recreation is highest. It should allow limited residential accommodation for those who manage recreational sites, such as at Milton Country Park and Coton Countryside Reserve, so as to ensure more sustainable, increased site surveillance and to help the prevention of anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The circumstances behind the need and appropriateness for dwellings associated with rural based enterprises are non</li> </ul>

	<p>generic and as such the greatest flexibility should be retained to ensure the Local Plan does not unnecessarily prescribe criteria that only fit certain circumstances. Such applications should be left able to be judged on their individual circumstances, merits and impacts, this flexibility is best retained by allowing direct interpretation of the NPPF by the applicant and case officers</p> <p><b>Question 58ii</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You don't need an extra policy, NPPF is enough</li> <li>• Support from 8 Parish Councils.</li> <li>• Related to questions I&amp;O1 questions 56 and 54 which state that the same criteria used for replacement and reuse of dwellings in the countryside could be used for this dwellings to support rural based enterprises</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The NPPF says plans should avoid new, isolated, homes in the countryside but there's no attempt to define 'isolation'</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy to govern the development of dwellings to support a rural based enterprise which includes specified criteria to be taken into consideration/satisfied. There was a clear majority of support for the inclusion of such a policy, objections being that no policy was needed as guidance is given in the NPPF.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy is sufficiently flexible to allow consideration of the merits of the provision of limited residential accommodation for those who manage recreational sites as they are covered by the words 'or in another business where a rural location is essential'.</li> </ul>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/18: Dwellings to Support a Rural-based Enterprise

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Chapter 13 – Bayer CropScience Site</b>	<b>Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton</b>
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Site Specific Policies DPD: Policy SP/8 Bayer CropScience, Hauxton
Analysis	The former Bayer CropScience site is a brownfield redevelopment site located on the A10 near Hauxton. The site was allocated for residential-led mixed-use development including B1 employment development, open space and community facilities in the Site Specific Policies DPD (adopted in January 2010). Outline planning

	<p>permission was granted for a scheme including up to 380 dwellings in February 2010. A reserved matters planning permission for phase 1 (201 dwellings) was granted in December 2012. Detailed masterplanning of the site has resulted in the site being anticipated to provide a total of 285 dwellings. The site was contaminated and remediation works have been undertaken, at time of writing site monitoring continues to be undertaken.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> None. The policy should be carried forward into the new Local Plan and remain until the development has been completed. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Carry forward the existing policy for the Bayer CropScience site into the new Local Plan. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy H/2: Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton</p>

<b>Issue 112</b>	<b>Papworth West Central, Papworth Everard</b>
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Site Specific Policies DPD: SP/10 Papworth Everard Village Development
Analysis	<p>Papworth West Central provides an opportunity to take a comprehensive approach to brownfield sites in the centre of Papworth Everard. The area contains a number of buildings that have reached the end of their structural life, or that are not currently in use. Rather than piecemeal development, there is an opportunity for considerable environmental improvement, and benefit to the functioning of the village, if a coordinated approach is taken to its development. There are particular opportunities to support the continued development of the centre of the village, particularly now the bypass has been completed.</p> <p>It is important to ensure that a mix of uses is achieved on this significant site, and that it does not become purely residential led. There has been a considerable amount of residential development in the village over the last decade and there is more to come. The four quadrants schemes will deliver in total over 1,000 dwellings, and there has also been substantial residential development on the former factory site in the village centre.</p> <p>This opportunity for area based regeneration has been recognised by the Council and other stakeholders, including Papworth Everard Parish Council. Progress has been made exploring site proposals.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> Retain policy to seek a mixed use redevelopment of this opportunity site to deliver a sustainable form of development and the continued invigoration of the village centre, or deal with proposals on their merits.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space,</p>

	and green infrastructure.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 112:</b> How can we best invigorate Papworth Everard?</p> <p>i) Should the Local Plan include a specific policy to seek mixed-use development with community uses, employment and housing development?</p> <p>ii) Or should we not include a policy and deal with individual site proposals on their merits?</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	The site comprises a number of previously developed sites within the village centre. Policy guidance could help ensure that they will deliver residential development whilst contributing to access to services and facilities objectives by further enhancing the village centre. Considering proposals on their merits could risk achievement of these goals, and provide fewer enhancements to the village centre, although this would clearly depend on the individual proposals.
Representations Received	<p>i: Support: 7, Object: 0, Comment: 1</p> <p>ii: Support: 2, Object: 0, Comment: 1</p> <p>Please provide any comments: Support: 0, Object: 0, Comment: 1</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Papworth Everard Parish Council – strongly support a policy as existing redevelopment of facilities is inadequate for the long term needs of the expanded village and a mixed used development will be essential to achieve a balanced outcome. The importance of providing new employment cannot be over-estimated. It will also be necessary to provide additional community facilities beyond those offered by the village hall.</li> <li>Existing services and facilities need to be expanded to cope with expansion already taking place, and need jobs for residents.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No policy is needed as proposals should be dealt with on their merits.</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Continue to include a policy for the redevelopment of Papworth Everard based on the principle of providing a mix of uses including community uses, employment uses and housing that will continue to invigorate the centre of the village.</p> <p>Papworth Everard Parish Council and others support the continuation of the policy to ensure that the necessary services and facilities are provided in the village for a sustainable community.</p> <p>Pre-application discussions have been undertaken and a planning application is expected (at the time of writing) for land south of Church Lane for residential development and the conversion of the former print-works building to uses including a community public house and bakery. This proposal covers the largest redevelopment site in the policy area. There are others but they are of a smaller scale. If the expected planning application is approved and</p>

	implemented it would deliver additional community facilities for the village, and a view would need to be reached whether the reasonable objectives of the current policy had been met and whether the policy was still needed.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/3: Papworth Everard West Central

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 113</b>	<b>Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate</b>
Key evidence	Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate Supplementary Planning Document (2011)
Existing policies	Site Specific Policies DPD: SP/11 Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate
Analysis	<p>The Land Settlement Association's activities at Fen Drayton are an earlier example of an attempt to achieve a more sustainable form of living but with the passage of time this has not proved to be an enduring model. The current legacy of the experiment is a network of small land holdings, a wide variety of land uses including some disuse, and a patchwork of buildings of variable quality. In view of the area's history and its current appearance, form and character a policy was developed in the Local Development Framework to allow it to evolve as a positive experimental test-bed for new forms of sustainable living. The policy focuses on utilising the built footprint of existing buildings no longer needed for agriculture, in order to protect the rural nature of the site.</p> <p>Following stakeholder and public consultation, a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted in May 2011 to guide how the policy should be implemented. It identified eligible buildings, and provided design guidance for new development. In particular it defined the sustainability standards development must achieve, Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 (or Level 5 in some circumstances) and any new non-residential buildings must achieve BREEAM non-residential outstanding standard.</p> <p>The SPD establishes the following principles for development to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design and construction of highly energy efficient buildings.</li> <li>• Provision of renewable energy technologies to provide heat and power e.g. solar thermal panels.</li> <li>• Inclusion of a garden and allotment for each dwelling to encourage food production.</li> <li>• Inclusion of either rainwater harvesting or greywater recycling (capturing rainwater or waste water for reuse by the occupiers).</li> <li>• Inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which naturally manage surface water run-off through the use of</li> </ul>

	<p>permeable surfaces and ponds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimisation of waste and inclusion of suitable storage for waste and recycling.</li> <li>• Enhancement of the biodiversity and ecology of the site.</li> <li>• Promotion and facilitation of opportunities that would allow an increase in the use of sustainable forms of transport and a reduction in car use.</li> </ul> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> Continue the policy approach, or do not carry forward and resist unsustainable development in the countryside.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 113:</b> What approach should the Local Plan take to the Fen Drayton LSA Area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Continue to support the redevelopment of existing buildings on the former Fen Drayton LSA site to support on-site experimental or other forms of sustainable living?</li> <li>ii) How do you think the former Fen Drayton LSA should evolve?</li> </ul>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>The option proposes to enable sustainable forms of development, utilising the built footprint of existing buildings, reflecting exiting policy. It is difficult to scale the impact of the policy as it depends on the level of uptake in this unusual site. Developments have the potential to contribute towards climate change mitigation and adaptation, in order to meet the specific requirements of the policy. Landscape and biodiversity impacts will depend on individual developments, but other requirements of the development plan to address these issues are assumed to apply. Access to alternative transport modes is limited, although the guided bus is within cycling distance. The Supplementary Planning Document seeks to address transport issues by promoting sustainable travel.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i: Support: 29, Object: 0, Comment: 9 ii: Support: 1, Object: 0, Comment: 7 Please provide any comments: Support: 0, Object: 0, Comment: 6</p>

Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support the redevelopment of existing buildings and the idea of restricting development to the footprint of former agricultural buildings is excellent as it allows limited development which will have minimal impact on the character of the area.</li> <li>• Such strict ‘experimental’ living criteria is unnecessary and makes development extremely difficult and expensive. Relaxing the criteria should be considered.</li> <li>• Support this scheme as it gives people the opportunity to build environmentally friendly dwellings, allows first time buyers the opportunity to remain in the village, and could provide opportunities for employment through small ‘cottage industry’ projects.</li> <li>• The SPD is extremely thorough and well thought out, with sound principles and was subject to extensive consultation. The situation has not changed.</li> <li>• Owners are extremely interested in developing relevant buildings, however the challenges of implementing the SPD should be examined and need better clarity concerning planning requirements.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should be subject to building regulations and sustainability standards applied to other planning applications – not applying the same criteria may be considered discriminatory.</li> <li>• Just because the site is outside the village framework should not mean it can automatically be considered as open countryside. Fen Drayton former LSA estate is already developed to some degree.</li> <li>• The policy area should be regularised to include the whole of Daintree’s Farm including its outbuildings, fields and ditch.</li> <li>• Middle Level Commissioners – it is understood that any concerns regarding the adverse impacts from this proposal have been alleviated; however caution should be taken if this becomes an allocated site.</li> <li>• The policy alone will not solve the problem of the untidy nature of the former LSA estate – limited additional development should be allowed to mitigate this problem, as the appearance of the LSA estate does not reflect well on the rest of the village.</li> <li>• Inconsistent approach with the Great Abington Former LSA Estate, where more flexible proposals have been subject to consultation.</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Continue to include a policy allowing the redevelopment of existing agricultural buildings for experimental and ground-breaking forms of sustainable living provided that it can be demonstrated that the buildings are no longer needed for agricultural purposes and the development would not occupy a larger footprint than the existing buildings that are being replaced. Amend the policy area to include Daintree’s Farm and its outbuildings.</p>

	<p>The majority of respondents are residents or landowners within the former LSA estate and there is general support for continuation of the policy.</p> <p>The Fen Drayton former Land Settlement Association estate is defined as being in the countryside and therefore the existing policy allows a greater scale and range of development than would normally be allowed in the countryside. To relax the criteria would effectively make this area an extension to the village and would result in an even greater level of development than that allowed through the existing policy. Two planning permissions for Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 dwellings within this policy area were granted on 2 January 2013.</p> <p>The Fen Drayton former LSA estate SPD notes in paragraph 3.20 that the adopted policy area boundary runs through Daintree's Farm and states that for the purposes of determining planning applications, the cow byre and dwelling are considered to be included in the policy area. The policy area boundary should therefore be amended.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/4: Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 114</b>	<b>Great Abington Former Land Settlement Association Estate</b>
Key evidence	
Existing policies	None.
Analysis	<p>A second former Land Settlement Association (LSA) estate in the district at Great Abington also has a different character to the open countryside around it. It includes a range of houses set along a pattern of narrow private roads, ranging from very small cottages that remain below the standards normally expected in modern life, to larger properties that have previously been extended. They generally sit in very large plots. Great Abington Parish Council has considered this issue locally with its community and there is support for an approach in the plan that reflects the specific local circumstances in the former LSA estate.</p> <p>The former Great Abington LSA estate is currently subject to the same controls over extensions to existing houses in the countryside and also the redevelopment of rural houses as the rest of the open countryside. Experience suggests that this area requires more flexibility to deal with the range of properties and the substandard nature of some housing. If the new plan contains a policy that retains the existing limits on new residential development, there would be a case to take a different approach in the former Great Abington LSA estate, providing greater flexibility and to treat applications on their</p>

	<p>merits on the basis of local character and the impact of the proposed development on the openness of the countryside and local amenity. If however, the new plan includes a more flexible policy that considers applications on the basis of local character and the impact of the proposed development on the openness of the countryside and local amenity, there would not be a need to include a specific policy for this area.</p> <p>The submission from Great Abington Parish Council dated May 2012, concerning extensions to dwellings in the former LSA estate advocates the creation of a special policy area for the former LSA estate governed by the following policy criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The estate remains outside the village envelope.</li> <li>2. The broadly rural nature of the estate should be preserved with all public footpaths and rights of way for horse riders retained.</li> <li>3. The roads will remain un-adopted by the Council and all residents using them will continue to be responsible for all on-going road and pathway maintenance including a distance of one metre either side of the road.</li> <li>4. Reasonable developments can proceed within the area as long as it would not result in a significant adverse impact on the unique character or appearance of the estate and would not result in an adverse impact on residential amenity or create unacceptable disturbance.</li> <li>5. All new building designs should be in keeping with the original housing stock on the estate.</li> <li>6. No development should be allowed that would result in a substantial increase in traffic on the estate, or the need for significant related road development, such as businesses that by their nature require large numbers of vehicle movements.</li> <li>7. Extensions to existing dwellings will be allowed as long as they do not result in a building that has a floor area exceeding 250 square metres and is in keeping with others in the area. However, the dwelling must continue to sit comfortably within its plot.</li> <li>8. The demolition and replacement of properties should be allowed as long as the new building does not exceed the floor area of the existing dwelling, or 250 square metres whichever is larger, and it is in keeping with others in the area. However, the dwelling must continue to sit comfortably within its plot.</li> <li>9. Each of the original 62 houses may be allowed to convert one existing outbuilding to a dwelling as long as adequate distances between neighbouring properties can still be maintained and the new building has a floor area of no more than 150 square metres and is in keeping with others in the area.</li> <li>10. All new or replacement dwellings should be set back from the roads at least as far as the original dwellings but will not be placed significantly further back on the plot, however small scale</li> </ol>
--	--

	<p>extensions to the front of an existing building may be allowed where a reasonable case is made.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> If the new Local Plan retains the existing approach to extensions and redevelopment, there would be a case to take a different approach in the former Great Abington former LSA estate, providing greater flexibility. If however, the new Local Plan includes a more flexible district wide policy, there would not be a need to include a specific policy for this area.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 114:</b> Do you consider that if the Local Plan retains limits on the scale of extensions to existing dwellings or the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside, a different approach should be taken in the former Great Abington Land Settlement Association area to provide greater flexibility?</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>The option would support the housing objective, allowing greater flexibility to deliver decent homes on this unusual site. There could be negative impact on landscape and townscape if development is out of scale with the rural character, but this is addressed specifically in the option to ensure this is appropriately addressed.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Support: 5, Object: 1, Comment: 10</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensions and replacement dwellings should be allowed but new dwellings should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances.</li> <li>• Emphasis should be placed on sustainable construction.</li> <li>• Support for having a special policy (as the site is neither countryside or within the village) to ensure consistency across the estate and to provide greater certainty for residents.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Abington Parish Council has submitted specific criteria and proposals for extensions, replacement dwellings and new dwellings:</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the former LSA estate to remain outside the village framework;</li> <li>▪ reasonable developments to be permitted as long as they would not result in adverse impact on the unique character and appearance of the area or on residential amenity;</li> <li>▪ no development that would result in a substantial increase in traffic or need significant road improvements;</li> <li>▪ extensions to be allowed provided that the total building floor area does not exceed 250 sqm;</li> <li>▪ replacements to be allowed provided that the new building does not exceed the floor area of the existing dwelling or 250 sqm (whichever is larger);</li> <li>▪ each of the existing 62 original dwellings to be allowed to convert one existing outbuilding to a dwelling, provided that the total floor area of the new building does not exceed 150 sqm; and</li> <li>▪ new and replacement dwellings to be set back from the roads, at least as far as the original but not significantly further back, and all new buildings to be in keeping with the original housing stock.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion that as an alternative, the whole estate should be considered for an ecologically sustainable housing site.</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Do not include a policy as the existing district wide policies for extensions and replacement dwellings in the countryside are being amended to remove the restrictions on size and to be a criteria based approach taking account of local character. A more flexible district wide approach will allow greater flexibility within the Great Abington former LSA estate and should ensure that the substandard nature of some homes can be rectified.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Abington Parish Council proposed some specific criteria for the former LSA area. These include restrictions on floorspace that are very prescriptive and it is not clear what the evidence is for the specific floorspace figures suggested. A more flexible district wide approach to extensions and replacement dwellings in the countryside should achieve the same outcomes.</li> <li>• Great Abington Parish Council also suggests that an additional 62 dwellings should be allowed through the conversion of outbuildings. This would be a large scale of development in the countryside and the area is close to Great Abington village which is a Group village and is not a sustainable location for substantial additional residential development.</li> <li>• The character of the Great Abington former LSA estate is different to the Fen Drayton former LSA estate, which includes</li> </ul>

	large areas of derelict outbuildings. It does not warrant a similar policy solution.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	No policy.

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 115</b>	<b>Linton Special Policy Area</b>
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: CH/10 Linton Special Policy Area
Analysis	<p>The southern part of Linton is severed by the A1307 from the rest of the village, which provides a barrier to easy movement. The area is characterised by three distinct uses: employment, a sensitive residential area much of which lies within the Conservation Area, and the site of Linton Zoo. Its location means that it has poor access to the village facilities and services, although there is a pelican crossing providing a safe crossing point and access to a bus stop on the Cambridge facing side of the main road. Bus services between Cambridge and Haverhill have been improved and this crossing is now well used.</p> <p>Part of the existing employment area has been suggested to the Council as a possible housing site and been tested as part of the plan making process. It performs well as a housing site against many criteria, being within a larger village and a previously used site. The main disadvantage of the site for housing is the loss of the employment use and its location in the southern part of Linton.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> The Local Plan could continue restricting further residential development south of the A1307 at Linton, or not include a policy.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<b>Question 115:</b> Should the Local Plan continue to restrict residential development south of the A1307 at Linton?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	By restricting development south of the A1307 the option aims to ensure appropriate access to services, and acknowledges that an isolated area would not work well as a residential location.
Representations Received	Support: 9, Object: 3, Comment: 3
Key Issues from	<b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b>

Representations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the continuation of the policy as the site has poor access to the village and the A1307 has a poor safety record.</li> <li>• Further development would add to the congestion through additional vehicles and increased use of the pelican crossing.</li> <li>• Policy remains relevant as community cohesion is important – the A1307 is not conducive to safe and convenient crossing for pedestrians. Development to the south of the A1307 would not visually relate well to the main settlement of Linton.</li> <li>• Suffolk County Council – support if the retention of the policy assists with promotion of road safety. Would welcome reference to transport issues in the wider area, and improving safety and reducing congestion on A1307.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential development should be allowed south of the A1307 as it is naïve to think that residents will walk to facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision should be made by Linton Parish Council.</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy restricting windfall residential development south of the A1307 at Linton due to it being difficult for residents, workers or visitors to safely and easily access the services and facilities in the centre of the village.</p> <p>The majority of respondents to this question support the continuation of the policy as the site has poor access to the village, further development would add to the congestion (additional vehicles and increased use of the pelican crossing), and the A1307 has a poor safety record.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In response to Suffolk County Council, the Planning for Sustainable Travel policy in the Transport and Infrastructure chapter requires developments with ‘significant transport implications’ (particularly congested locations, generating larger numbers of trips, particular local travel problems including road safety) to make adequate provision to mitigate the likely impacts.</li> </ul>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/5: South of A1307, Linton

<b>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2) Issue 9</b>	<b>Residential Moorings on the River Cam</b>
Key evidence	
Existing policies	None.
Analysis	Following the Issues and Options 2012 consultation, the Conservators of the River Cam have expressed their disappointment

	<p>that the consultation did not identify the River Cam as a piece of major infrastructure. The Conservators specifically seek the allocation of a marina for 'offline' residential moorings for 60-80 narrowboats on the River Cam at Chesterton Fen, each between 15-20m in length. The Cambridge Local Plan 2006 has an allocation adjacent to the administrative boundary in Chesterton Fen for off-river moorings and the City Council is consulting in its Part 2 Issues and Options 2 consultation on whether to carry forward the allocation. Land adjoining the City site in South Cambridgeshire could be considered to provide a larger site subject to detailed consideration, although this would not provide the scale of site the Conservators are seeking.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p><b>Question 9:</b> Do you support or object to the site option for a residential mooring at Fen Road and why?</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>Provision of residential moorings on the River Cam would support the objective of delivering a range of housing, providing opportunities to accommodate house boats. The site would negatively impact on the landscape of the area, which currently comprises small enclosed paddocks along the river.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Support: 1 Object: 3 Comment: 2</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• River congested already, additional moorings required.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has consideration been given to compatibility with needs of other users of river? Should be considered as part of masterplan for whole Northern Fringe East area.</li> <li>• Will make river side path more inconvenient, either having to make elongated journey around entire marina, or having to cross steep bridge.</li> <li>• <b>Milton Parish Council</b> - opposes marina in Green Belt. Already problems with road access along Fen Road - resolve first. Currently no mains sewerage connection.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> - River Cam corridor is County Wildlife Site. SA</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- mixture of positive and negative impacts on wildlife could result</li> <li>- suitable mitigation will need to be identified if taken forward.</li> </ul>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a site allocation for residential moorings on Chesterton Fen Road, Milton.</p> <p>Delivery of additional moorings will help address river congestion in Cambridge. The allocation adjoins a site previously identified in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and proposed in the new Cambridge Local Plan.</p> <p>Environmental issues are capable of being addressed appropriately, and the draft policy seeks an appropriate site design to minimise impact on the wider Green Belt. The impact on the riverside path will need to be considered and addressed to ensure it remains a convenient route for users.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy H/6: Residential Moorings