



South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission  
Sustainability Appraisal

Appendix 3: Audit Trail  
Audit Summary of all Chapters

Prepared for:  
**South Cambridgeshire District Council**

Prepared by:  
**ENVIRON**  
**Exeter, UK**

Date:  
**March 2014**

Project or Issue Number:  
**UK18-18630**

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Contract No:                             | UK18-18630 |
| Issue:                                   | 3          |
| Author<br>(signature):                   | SCDC       |
| Project Manager/Director<br>(signature): |            |
| Date:                                    | March 2014 |

*This report has been prepared by ENVIRON with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, and taking account of the Services and the Terms agreed between ENVIRON and the Client. This report is confidential to the client, and ENVIRON accepts no responsibility whatsoever to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known, unless formally agreed by ENVIRON beforehand. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.*

*ENVIRON disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the agreed scope of the Services.*

| <b>Version Control Record</b> |   |             |                          |                        |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Issue</b>                  | <b>Description of Status</b>                            | <b>Date</b> | <b>Reviewer Initials</b> | <b>Author Initials</b> |
| 1                             | Draft for Cabinet                                       | June 2013   | VTT                      | SCDC                   |
| 2                             | Final for Consultation with Local Plan Submission Draft | June 2013   | VTT                      | SCDC                   |
| 3                             | Final for Submission                                    | March 2014  | LV                       | SCDC                   |

# 1 Introduction

This appendix sets out a summary of the alternatives tested and the preferred approach. The information is set out in a series of tables consisting of one for each policy chapter of the Local Plan.

The tables are set out as follows:

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy                          | Page 3 A-48  |
| Table 2: Chapter 3 Strategic Sites                           | Page 3 A-59  |
| Table 3: Chapter 4 Climate Change                            | Page 3 A-64  |
| Table 4: Chapter 5 Delivering High Quality Places            | Page 3 A-71  |
| Table 5: Chapter 6 Built and Natural Environment             | Page 3 A-73  |
| Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes             | Page 3 A-79  |
| Table 7: Chapter 8 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy | Page 3 A-90  |
| Table 8: Chapter 9 Successful Communities                    | Page 3 A-101 |
| Table 9: Chapter 10 Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure | Page 3 A-110 |

| <b>Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy</b> |              |  |   |   |
|--|--------------|--|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                        | <b>Issue</b> | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>1</b>                      | Vision       | The consultation proposed to use the Council's corporate vision for the Local Plan: <i>South Cambridgeshire will continue to be the best place to live and work in the country. Our district will demonstrate impressive and sustainable economic growth. Our residents will have a superb quality of life in an exceptionally beautiful, rural and green environment.</i> | Retain the Council's corporate vision as the Vision for the Local Plan.   | How the vision is implemented is addressed by objectives, and subsequently by policies and proposals.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>2</b>                      | Objectives   | The Issues and Options Report proposed a set of 6 objectives that the Local Plan would aim to achieve.   | Include all 6 objectives in the Local Plan, subject to a number of amendments.  | Provide an effective set of objectives for implementing the vision.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>3</b>                      | Jobs Target  | How much new employment do you consider the Local Plan should provide for?<br><br>i) Lower jobs growth – 14,000 additional jobs over the Plan period (700 jobs per year)<br>ii) Medium jobs growth - 23,100 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,200 jobs per year)<br>iii) High jobs growth - 29,200 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,500 jobs per year)        | The number of jobs to be included in the Local Plan is 22,000 additional jobs which is the figure identified as the objectively assessed needs of the district identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. | The NPPF says that plans should make every effort to objectively identify and then meet business needs, taking account of market signals.<br><br>The figure is close to the Medium option consulted on in 2012. The Council considers this will support the Cambridge Cluster and provide for the creation of a diverse range of local jobs within the plan period. |

| <b>Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy</b> |                    |   |  |  |
|--|--------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                        | <b>Issue</b>       | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>4</b>                      | Housing Provision  | <p>A. How much new housing do you consider the Local Plan should provide for?</p> <p>i) Lower housing growth - additional 4,300 dwellings (equal to 925 dwellings per year)</p> <p>ii) Medium housing growth - additional 6,800 dwellings (equates to 1,050 dwellings per year)</p> <p>iii) High housing growth - additional 9,300 dwellings (equate to 1,175 dwellings per year)</p> <p>B. Do you agree with the assumption for delivery of housing at Northstowe of approximately 500 homes per year?</p> | The SHMA identifies the objectively assessed need for 19,000 new homes in South Cambridgeshire by 2031. This is reflected in the draft local plan. | <p>The NPPF says that plans should make every effort to objectively identify and then meet housing needs, taking account of market signals.</p> <p>The outcome of this work on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies the objectively assessed need for 19,000 new homes in South Cambridgeshire by 2031. The figure of 19,000 new homes implies an average delivery rate of 950 homes per year.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>5</b>                      | Windfall Allowance | Do you consider that the Plan should include an allowance for windfall development?   | Do not rely on windfall allowance.   | The Council has fully allocated its housing requirement. The housing trajectory shows that existing completions and commitments and new allocations could provide 19,379 homes in the plan period. The Council has not relied on windfall sites even though it is confident that there will be a continuing supply of housing on such sites.   |

| <b>Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy</b> |  |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                        | <b>Issue</b>                                 | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|  |  |   |   | Windfalls have not been relied on to meet the housing requirement; instead they provide greater reassurance that delivery rates will be achieved.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>6</b>                      | Providing a 5-year land supply               | What level of 5-year land supply buffer do you think the Council should plan for that would be capable of being brought forward from later in the plan period?<br><br>i) 5% buffer; or<br>ii) 20% buffer. | 5% buffer.  | the Council considers that the normal 5% buffer is the appropriate buffer for the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan with an end date of 2031.<br><br>The Council has fully allocated its housing requirement (the housing trajectory shows that existing completions and commitments and new allocations could provide 19,379 homes in the plan period). The Council has not relied on windfall sites even though it is confident that there will be a continuing supply of housing on such sites and therefore these sites could help make up any shortfall if that were to occur at any point during the plan period. |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>7</b>                      | Localism and Relationship with Neighbourhood | Do you think local aspirations can be reflected in the Local Plan?  | A number of proposals were submitted by Parish Councils to the Council during the consultation. | Reasons are addressed against individual proposals.   |

| <b>Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy</b>      |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                             | <b>Issue</b>                                     | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|   | Development Plans                                | If yes, how can this best be done? If no, why do you take that view?   | They resulted in the following draft policies<br>Policy E/8: Mixed-use development in Histon & Impington Station area<br>Policy SC/1: Allocations for Open Space<br>Policy S/7: Development Frameworks (village led changes)<br>Policy NH/12: Local Green Space<br>Other policies were not progressed e.g. PC” Cottenham. |   |
| <b>I&amp;O1 8</b>                               | Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development | Do you think the Local Plan should include a specific policy focusing development on the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, where the land is not of high environmental value?  | Include a policy but address sustainable development more widely.   | The policy is drawn from the National Planning Policy Framework and the model sustainable development policy provided by the Planning Inspectorate for inclusion within all local plans |
| <b>I&amp;O1 9</b><br><b>I&amp;O2 (Part 1) 1</b> | Development Strategy                             | Question 9: What do you think is the best approach to the development strategy for South Cambridgeshire? All options are expected to need to involve some village development to provide flexibility and early housing provision:<br><br>i. Cambridge focus (would require a review of the Green Belt) | Addressed separately.   | Addressed separately.   |

| <b>Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy</b> |              |   |   |   |
|--|--------------|---|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                        | <b>Issue</b> | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>                       | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|  |              | ii. New Settlement focus<br>iii. Sustainable Villages focus (would require a review of the Green Belt)<br>iv. Combination of the above<br><br>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1)<br><br>Question 1: Where do you think the appropriate balance lies between protecting land on the edge of Cambridge that is of high significance to Green Belt purposes and delivering development away from Cambridge in new settlements and at better served villages? |   |   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>10</b>                     | Green Belt   | Do you think that the Green Belt purposes and functions remain appropriate for the new Plan?  | Include purposes and functions of the Green Belt in the New Local Plan. | The NPPF sets out five purposes for Green Belts, the key one for the Cambridge Green Belt being: “to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns”. The purposes and functions of the Cambridge Green Belt have been established in previous Local Plans and are intended to help achieve the preservation of the setting of Cambridge and its special character. The Council considers they remain |

| <b>Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy</b> |   |  |   |   |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                        | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|  |   |  |   | sound and this is supported by the comments received during the Issues & Options consultation.  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>11</b>                     | Considering Exceptional Circumstances for a Green Belt review | Do you consider that more land, beyond that already released and committed, on the edge of Cambridge and potentially at larger villages, should be released from the Green Belt in order to achieve sustainable development? | Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council jointly undertook a joint review of the inner Green Belt boundary in 2012.<br><br>Six site options were subject to consultation through the Issues and Options 2013. | The Council needs to achieve a Green Belt boundary that will endure into the future and that is compatible with long term sustainable development particularly in the light of the unavailability of Cambridge Airport at least during the lifetime of the new Local Plan. The edge of Cambridge is the next most sustainable location for growth in the development sequence after the urban area of Cambridge but a balance must be achieved between the benefits of the accessibility aspects of sustainable development and need to protect the special qualities of Cambridge as a compact historic city with an attractive setting protected by the Green Belt. |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>12</b>                     | Green Belt Locations  | Both Councils took a joined up approach in the issues and options consultations in Summer 2012 and asked whether land should be  | Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council jointly undertook a joint review of the inner  | As above.   |

| <b>Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy</b> |                             |  |   |  |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                        | <b>Issue</b>                | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|  |                             | released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, and if so, where this should be. Ten broad locations around the edge of Cambridge were consulted on.  | Green Belt boundary in 2012.<br><br>Six site options were subject to consultation through the Issues and Options 2013.  |  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>13</b>                     | Rural Settlement Categories | <p>Which, if any, of the following changes to the rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?</p> <p>Rural Centres:<br/>Should Cottenham be added as a Rural Centre (up from a Minor Rural Centre)?<br/>Should Fulbourn be deleted from the Rural Centre category and added as a Minor Rural Centre?</p> <p>Minor Rural Centres:<br/>iii. Should the following be added as Minor Rural Centres?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Milton</li> <li>- Swavesey</li> <li>- Bassingbourn</li> </ul> | <p>The preferred approach was to:</p> <p>Add Cottenham as Rural Centre.<br/>Add Fulbourn, Milton, Swavesey, Bassingbourn, Girton, and Comberton to the list of Minor Rural Centres.<br/>Do not include a separate category of 'Better served Group Villages'.</p> | <p>Cottenham compares favourably with existing rural centres, whilst Fulbourn does not, and compares better with existing Minor Rural Centres. They should therefore be swapped.</p> <p>Five settlements stood out above existing Group villages, particularly due to the presence of employment, public transport, secondary education and proximity to Cambridge. Rather than creating an additional stage, these have been included as Minor Rural Centres. This reduces complexity of the hierarchy, and these factors justify their higher position in the hierarchy.</p> |

| <b>Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy</b> |              |  |   |                           |
|--|--------------|--|---|---------------------------|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                        | <b>Issue</b> | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b> | <b>Summary of Reasons</b> |
|  |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Girton</li> <li>- Comberton</li> </ul> <p>Better Served Group Villages:</p> <p>iv. Should there be a further sub division of village categories to create a new category of better served group villages?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Milton</li> <li>- Swavesey</li> <li>- Bassingbourn</li> <li>- Girton</li> <li>- Comberton</li> </ul> <p>v. If so, should the 3 Minor Rural Centres that score less than the Better Served Group villages be changed to fall within this new category? They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Papworth Everard</li> </ul> |   |                           |

| <b>Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy</b> |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                        | <b>Issue</b>                             | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Willingham</li> <li>- Waterbeach</li> </ul> <p>Other Group Villages and Infill Villages:</p> <p>vi. Should these remain in the same categories as in the current plan?</p>  |  |  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>14</b>                     | Scale of Housing Development at Villages | <p>What approach do you think the Local Plan should take for individual housing schemes within village frameworks on land not specially identified for housing:</p> <p>Retain existing numerical limits for individual schemes</p> <p>Increase the size allowed for individual schemes.</p> <p>Remove scheme size limits for Minor Rural Centres, and if included for Better Served Group Villages, so they are the same as Rural Centres</p> <p>Remove scheme size limits for all categories of village</p> | Option I. Retain scale limits from Core Strategy 2007.   | The existing thresholds provide a reasonable balance between allowing development, and avoiding unsustainable levels of growth in areas with limited access to services, facilities and employment by sustainable modes of travel. |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>15</b>                     | Approach to Village                      | A: Do you think the new Local Plan should:   | Option I. Include a development framework policy allowing infill development to occur in villages, and | On balance it is considered that not including frameworks would undermine the sustainable  |

| <b>Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy</b> |              |   |  |   |
|--|--------------|---|--|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                        | <b>Issue</b> | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
| <b>I&amp;O2 (Part 2)<br/>6 &amp; 7</b>     | Frameworks   | <p>i. retain village frameworks and the current approach to restricting development outside framework boundaries as defined on the Proposals Map</p> <p>ii. retain village frameworks as defined on the Proposals Map but include policies that allow small scale development adjacent to village frameworks where certain criteria are met, addressing issues including landscape, townscape, and access.</p> <p>iii. delete the current village frameworks entirely and provide greater flexibility for some development on the edge of villages controlled through a written policy.</p> <p>B. Are you aware of any existing village framework boundaries that are not drawn appropriately because they do not follow property boundaries?</p> <p>The 2012 Issues and Options consultation gave the opportunity to</p> | <p>restricting development in the countryside to uses that need to be located there or consistent with other policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The village frameworks boundaries will be carried forward from the adopted plan, together with a small number of amendments as follows: Options VF1, VF3, VF4, VF5, VF7, VF8, PC3, Hillside at Orwell, and White Field Way at Sawston.</p> | <p>development strategy being established through the plan, by loosening controls on the scale of development in rural areas. It could also undermine the delivery of affordable housing exception sites, which are important mechanism for meeting affordable housing needs in rural areas. Elements of flexibility have been introduced for specific uses by other policies in the plan, and a general loosening of development framework policy is not required.</p> <p>Options PC1, PC2 and PC4-13 did not demonstrate sufficient local support and should not be included within the draft Local Plan.</p> |

| <b>Table 1: Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy</b> |   |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                        | <b>Issue</b>                              | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b> | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|  |   | suggest where existing village framework boundaries are not drawn appropriately. The Council received 73 representations proposing amendments to village framework boundaries.  |   |  |
| <b>I&amp;O2 (Part 2)<br/>5</b>             | Development to Fund a Bypass in Cottenham | Do you support or object to the development proposed by Cottenham Parish Council, that are geared to provide jobs, satisfy affordable housing needs, provide recreational and shopping facilities, and fund bypass, and if so, why? | Do not include an allocation in the Local Plan.   | This proposal is not consistent with the Local Plan, and from the consultation responses does not appear to have an overall majority of local support. |

| <b>Table 2: Chapter 3 Strategic Sites</b>   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>   | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b> | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
| <p><b>I&amp;O1<br/>16</b></p> <p><b>I&amp;O2 (Part 1)<br/>Chapter 9<br/>Questions 2<br/>and 3</b></p> <p><b>I&amp;O2 (Part 2)<br/>Issue 1</b></p> | <p>Development Options</p>                           | <p>Over 300 sites have been tested, as well as 41 sites tested jointly with Cambridge City Council on the edge of Cambridge.</p> <p>A total of 63 potential site options for housing development have been consulted on during the Issue &amp; Options consultations.</p> | <p>Addressed separately.</p>                      | <p>Addressed separately.</p>  |
| <p><b>Issues and Options 2012<br/>Chapter 13 – Orchard Park</b></p>   | <p>Cambridge Northern Fringe West (Orchard Park)</p> | <p>Carry forward the existing policy into the new Local Plan</p>  | <p>Carry forward policy into new Local Plan.</p>  | <p>The Orchard Park site was originally allocated for mixed-use development including 900 dwellings in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 and the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document (adopted January 2010) carried forward the allocation. Outline planning permission was granted in 2005 and has lapsed. The majority of the development has been completed. Pre-application discussions are on-going to bring forward Parcel K1 for 36 self-build dwellings, which is the last remaining housing parcel from the original Development Framework Plan.</p> |

| <b>Table 2: Chapter 3 Strategic Sites</b>         |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                               | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |   |   |  | The policy should be carried forward into the new Local Plan and remain until the development has been completed.  |
| <b>Issues and Options 2012 Chapter 13 – NIAB2</b> | North West Cambridge – Huntingdon Road to Histon Road (NIAB2) | Carry forward the existing policy into the new Local Plan.  | Carry forward the existing policy into the new Local Plan but include amendments to reflect the inclusion of the adjoining land (NIAB3). This additional site was considered through the joint edge of Cambridge Green Belt review, and subject to consultation as site GB6 in the joint Issues and Options 2013 consultation. | Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, known as Darwin Green 2 and formerly NIAB 2, was released from the Green Belt for a sustainable housing-led urban extension of Cambridge in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document (adopted in January 2010). The site is adjacent to the Cambridge City Council allocation at NIAB1.<br><br>The policy should be carried forward into the new Local Plan and remain until the development has been completed. |
| <b>I&amp;O1 108</b>                               | Cambridge East  | What approach should the Local Plan take to Cambridge Airport?<br><br>i. Retain the current allocation for development at Cambridge East.<br>ii. Safeguard the site for development after 2031 or through a review of the | Option ii. Safeguard the site for future development.  | Marshall has made clear its intention to remain at its current site for the foreseeable future. Notwithstanding, in the event that Marshall were to decide in the longer term to make the site available for development, a major urban expansion to Cambridge at the Cambridge Airport site remains the most sustainable location for long term   |

| <b>Table 2: Chapter 3 Strategic Sites</b> |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                       | <b>Issue</b>                             | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |  | Local Plan.<br>iii. Return the whole site to the Green Belt or just the parts of the site which are open   |  | development.<br><br>In plan making terms, it is a reasonable and appropriate response to the changed circumstances since the current plan to apply a safeguarding policy to the Airport site, safeguarded for possible long term new urban quarter to Cambridge if it becomes available, and that it would be brought forward through a review of the Local Plan. The Cambridge East Area Action Plan would remain 'live' and could be drawn on as necessary, either in its current form or through a review depending on circumstances at the time of any future development. |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>109</b>                   | Cambridge East – North of Newmarket Road | What approach should the Council take to the potential for housing development on land North of Newmarket Road at Cambridge East? Should the Council:<br><br>Conclude that development cannot be relied on and the site be treated in the same way as Cambridge Airport?<br><br>Rely upon the policies of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan to | Address in policy, which will replace Cambridge East Area Action Plan Policies CE/3 and CE/35, identifying allocations north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton, and safeguarding the remainder of the airport site. | The Cambridge East Area Action Plan provides an up to date policy framework for development of land north of Newmarket Road. The AAP allowed for development on this area, either as an early phase of the full Cambridge East development or as a stand alone new neighbourhood to Cambridge.   |

| <b>Table 2: Chapter 3 Strategic Sites</b> |                                |  |  |   |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                       | <b>Issue</b>                   | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|   |                                | <p>determine any planning applications for development?</p> <p>Include a new policy for the site in the Local Plan allocating the land for a housing-led development?</p>  |  | <p>Marshall is currently in pre-application discussions with the Council and intending to bring forward development and there is no need to include a policy in the new Local Plan, which could have the effect of delaying development of this site in a sustainable location on the edge of Cambridge and would not provide such a detailed policy framework for considering a planning application on this site.</p> <p>As the site is likely to deliver residential development during the plan period, it has been included in the Housing Trajectory.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>109</b>                   | Cambridge Northern Fringe East | <p>What do you think are the key principles for the development of Cambridge Northern Fringe East?</p> <p>i. Do you agree with our vision for the area?</p> <p>ii. Have we identified the right key principles for development?</p> <p>iii. What sites should be included in the boundary of the area?</p> | <p>Include a policy to enable the creation of a revitalised, employment focussed area centred on a new transport interchange, with a joint approach to planning with Cambridge City Council.</p> <p>Include a policy safeguarding land at Chesterton Sidings for the development of a railway station and interchange facility in the Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport</p> | <p>There is general support for a high quality, employment-led redevelopment. An area action plan is now proposed to be prepared, to enable the effective regeneration of the area and provide a more comprehensive joint policy. Work is already underway with the City and County Councils and local stakeholders to develop an implementations plan.</p>   |

| <b>Table 2: Chapter 3 Strategic Sites</b> |              |                                |   |                           |
|---|--------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                       | <b>Issue</b> | <b>Alternatives Considered</b> | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission<br/>Local Plan</b> | <b>Summary of Reasons</b> |
|   |              |                                | and Infrastructure Chapter.                           |                           |

| <b>Table 3: Chapter 4 Climate Change</b> |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                      | <b>Issue</b>                                 | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>17</b>                   | Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change    | Have the right issues for addressing climate change mitigation and adaptation been identified?   | Include a policy requiring that the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation are embedded within all development proposals, with all the issues in Question 17, but including the creation and enlargement of a better linked habitat network as an additional issue to consider. In the sustainable transport and infrastructure chapter acknowledge the challenge of reducing car use and promoting the use of sustainable forms of transport in a rural district. | <p>The Planning Act 2008 requires local planning authorities to include policies in their Local Plans designed to secure development and use of land that will contribute to the 'mitigation' of, and 'adaptation' to, climate change.</p> <p>The principles of climate change adaptation and mitigation are embedded within policies throughout the Local Plan, and therefore to avoid repetition the climate change adaptation and mitigation policy is succinct and references are provided in the supporting text to the key principles that should be considered with references to the detailed policies.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>18</b>                   | Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments | <p>A: What approach do you think the Local Plan should take for the generation of renewable and low carbon energy?</p> <p>i. Include a criteria based policy seeking to maximise the generation of renewable and low carbon energy in the district and identifying the issues that would need to be addressed, and this would leave developers</p> | <p>Option Aii. Include a criteria based policy identifying issues that would need to be addressed as listed in Question 18, such as impact on heritage, natural assets, agricultural land and nearby residents.</p> <p>Include as part of the policy for</p>   | <p>National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should deliver renewable and low carbon energy in their area.</p> <p>Policy identifies issues to be addressed by proposals.</p>  |

| <b>Table 3: Chapter 4 Climate Change</b> |                                |  |   |   |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                      | <b>Issue</b>                   | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|  |                                | <p>to make applications for their preferred areas.</p> <p>ii. Include a criteria based policy as set out in option i, but specifically requiring a separation distance of 2 km between a proposed wind farm (2 or more wind turbines) and any residential property, to protect residents from disturbance and visual impact. If the applicant can prove this is not the case a shorter distance will be considered.</p> <p>B: Should the Local Plan identify future growth areas and new settlements as potentially suitable locations for the inclusion of renewable or low carbon district heating systems?</p> <p>C: What type of renewable and low carbon energy sources should the Local Plan consider and at what scale?</p> | <p>renewable and low carbon energy in new developments a requirement that growth areas and new settlements maximise onsite generation from these sources, but without specifying the type of technology to be used.</p> | <p>To protect the amenity of local residents from unacceptable adverse effects, the policy includes the Council’s resolution on wind farms as one of the criteria that must be considered in discussions relating to proposals for wind turbines.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>19</b>                   | Renewables in New Developments | <p>To what extent should new development provide for onsite renewable energy generation?</p> <p>All new developments should be required to</p>   | <p>Policy requiring: all new dwellings to meet a minimum of 10% of their total emissions using renewable technologies; and all new non-residential buildings of 1,000 sqm or more to reduce</p>                         | <p>New developments, such as housing, employment and community uses, can generate their own renewable energy by incorporating micro-generation of renewable and low carbon energy</p>   |

| <b>Table 3: Chapter 4 Climate Change</b> |                                     |   |  |   |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                      | <b>Issue</b>                        | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|  |                                     | <p>provide onsite renewable energy? If so, should 10%, 15% or 20% equivalent provision be required?</p> <p>Small scale developments of less than 5 dwellings or less than 500 m<sup>2</sup> of non-residential floor space should be exempt?</p> <p>No requirements for renewable energy generation should be made.</p> | <p>their emissions of carbon dioxide by 10% through the installation of renewable technologies, and allowing the use of site wide renewable or low carbon energy solutions involving the installation of a system that is not integrated within the new building.</p>  | <p>into their design. This will also contribute to the achievement of national renewable energy targets.</p> <p>The Council's evidence base document (Review of Merton Rule-style Policies in four Local Planning Authorities in Cambridgeshire) demonstrates that 10% remains an achievable and reasonable target, that can be applied to all dwellings.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>20</b>                   | Community Energy Fund               | <p>A: Should the Local Plan enable the setting up of a Community Energy Fund that would allow developers to invest in offsite energy efficiency and renewable and low carbon energy projects to meet their carbon reduction targets?</p> <p>i: Yes?<br/>ii: No?</p> <p>B: Are there other alternatives?</p>             | <p>Include a reference in the supporting text to the policy on Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change that if a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund is established, the Council's preference is for any 'allowable solutions' monies secured to be paid into the fund and therefore spent locally.</p> | <p>To support the implementation of the Government's zero carbon policy.</p>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>21</b>                   | Sustainable Design and Construction | <p>What sustainable building standards should be required in new developments?</p>  | <p>Option I. Do not include a policy but use Building Regulations to determine the energy efficiency of</p>  | <p>Achieving higher code levels would increase costs, and could impact on the viability of development. On balance it is considered that the</p>  |

| <b>Table 3: Chapter 4 Climate Change</b> |                        |  |   |  |
|--|------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                      | <b>Issue</b>           | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|  |                        | <p>i. Developments would only have to comply with Building Regulations requirements for energy efficiency.</p> <p>ii. All new buildings would comply with sustainable building standards. If so, should all new dwellings meet at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4, and all non-residential schemes meet at least the BREEAM 'very good' standard?</p> <p>iii. The zero carbon standard (Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5) would be required in larger scale developments?</p> | new buildings.  | changes to Building Regulations offers the most appropriate solution for the district, balanced with the competing demands for developer contributions, including infrastructure and affordable housing.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>22</b>                   | Sustainable Show-Homes | <p>What approach to sustainable show-homes should we take?</p> <p>i. Rely on negotiating their provision on an individual site basis?</p> <p>ii. Require all developments that include a show-home to provide a sustainable show-home?</p> <p>iii. Require developments of over 15 dwellings to provide a sustainable show-</p>  | Option ii. Include a policy requiring developments that are providing a show home to provide a sustainable show home (either separately or instead of the show home) demonstrating environmentally sustainable alternatives beyond those already provided to achieve the standard agreed for the development. | To encourage buyers to opt to purchase more sustainable dwellings on our new developments, it is important that they are made aware of how the sustainability of the building can be improved through the use of environmentally friendly alternatives to standard conventional options, and what the benefits will be for them when they are living in there. |

| <b>Table 3: Chapter 4 Climate Change</b> |                      |   |   |  |
|--|----------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                      | <b>Issue</b>         | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|  |                      | home?   |   |  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>23</b>                   | Construction Methods | <p>What approach should the Local Plan take to construction methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Continue to include a construction methods policy?</li> <li>ii. Not specify construction methods in the Local Plan?</li> </ul>   | <p>Option I. Include a policy requiring that development which by its nature or extent is likely to have some adverse impact on the local environment and amenity during construction and / or generate construction waste proposals must carefully manage materials to reduce the amount of waste produced and maximise the reuse or recycling of materials and that constructors are considerate to neighbouring occupiers.</p> | <p>The construction process for any new development utilises a significant amount of resources, generates construction waste and spoil, and can adversely affect the amenity of surrounding occupiers and the local natural environment, through the generation of noise, smells and dust.</p>   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>24</b>                   | Water Efficiency     | <p>What approach should the Local Plan take on water efficiency in new housing development?</p> <p>What are your views on the following options?</p> <p>Rely on Building Regulations standards to reduce water use below the average existing levels.</p> <p>Seek additional measures such as water efficient fixtures and fittings (to achieve</p> | <p>Option ii. Include a policy on Water Efficiency, seeking the equivalent of code for sustainable homes level 4 (105 litres per person per day), and similar improvements based on the BREEAM standard for non-domestic buildings</p>  | <p>The majority of respondents, including the Environment Agency and Cambridge Water, strongly support requirements for higher standards of water efficiency due to the district being within an area of water stress.</p> <p>In terms of balancing development viability with efficiency savings, the Code 4 equivalent offers a reduction in water use against building regulations of 20 litres per</p> |

| <b>Table 3: Chapter 4 Climate Change</b> |                              |  |  |  |
|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                      | <b>Issue</b>                 | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|  |                              | <p>equivalent of Code 3 or 4 of Code for Sustainable Homes), subject to financial viability.</p> <p>Seek grey water or rainwater recycling (to achieve equivalent of code 5 or 6 of Code for Sustainable Homes), subject to financial viability.</p> |  | <p>person per day, and can be achieved at low additional cost. The higher code 5 standard, which requires water recycling, would have much higher cost implications, particularly for small developments.</p>                                    |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>25</b>                   | Water Quality                | <p>A: Have the right approaches to managing, protecting and enhancing water quality been identified?</p> <p>B: Are there any other issues which should be included?</p>  | <p>Include a policy requiring that new development does not result in the deterioration of water quality.</p>    | <p>The Council has a duty to ensure that there is improvement to water body quality through its policies and actions, including planning.</p>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>26</b>                   | Sustainable Drainage Systems | <p>A: Have the right approaches to managing water and drainage sustainably been identified?</p> <p>B: Are there any other issues which should be included?</p>   | <p>Include a policy requiring that sustainable surface water drainage is integrated within new developments.</p> | <p>The National Planning Policy Framework requires development to give priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems. This policy proposed is a manifestation of the recommendation with the Water Cycle Strategy Phase 2 (July 2011).</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>27</b>                   | Flood Risk                   | <p>A: Have the right approaches to managing flood risk been identified?</p>  | <p>Include a policy to manage development and flood risk.</p>  | <p>A policy is needed in the Local Plan to provide local context. There is considerable flood risk in parts of</p>   |

| <b>Table 3: Chapter 4 Climate Change</b> |              |   |   |  |
|--|--------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                      | <b>Issue</b> | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>                          | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b> | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>                                    |
|  |              | B: Are there any other issues which should be included? |   | the district, and it is of significant concern to residents. |

| <b>Table 4: Chapter 5 Delivering High Quality Places</b> |                              |  |  |  |
|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                      | <b>Issue</b>                 | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>28</b>                                   | Securing High Quality Design | <p>A: Have the right design principles been identified to achieve high quality design in all new developments?</p> <p>B: Should the Local Plan provide guidance on design of streets to improve the public realm, including minimum street widths and street trees?</p> <p>C: Do you think the Council should retain and update the District Design Guide?</p> <p>D: Would you like your village to produce its own design guide? If so, please let us know which village so that we can discuss how to take this forward with the local Parish Council.</p> | Include a criteria-based policy outlining the design principles to be addressed in all new developments, and incorporating guidance on improving the public realm (B).   | <p>The National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning for sustainable development involves replacing poor design with good design. Planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p> <p>In reviewing the policy, greater emphasis has been placed on responding to local character and reinforcing local distinctiveness to secure a more place-responsive design from developers, and addressing public realm issues, in response to comments received.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>29</b>                                   | Public Art                   | What approach do you think the Local Plan should take on public art?   | Include a policy encouraging the provision of public art which allows for greater flexibility in terms of allowing art in a wider sense, but also requires more local involvement in the decision-making process | The public art policy only encourages provision of public art as a means of enhancing the quality of development. In reviewing the policy greater emphasis is given to local involvement in the decision-making process, including having regard to the local circumstances of the site  |

| <b>Table 4: Chapter 5 Delivering High Quality Places</b> |              |                                |                                     |   |
|--|--------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                      | <b>Issue</b> | <b>Alternatives Considered</b> | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b> | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>                                   |
|  |              |                                |                                     | and/or local aspirations, in response to comments received. |

| <b>Table 5: Chapter 6 Built and Natural Environment</b> |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>                              | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>30</b>                                  | Landscape Character                       | Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring development proposals to reflect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the landscape?  | Include a policy requiring development proposals to reflect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the landscape as set out in the issue.  | Landscape character should be protected. With good design new development can add to the character of an area.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>31</b>                                  | Protecting high quality agricultural land | Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking to protect best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1,2, and 3a) from unplanned development?   | Include a policy seeking to protect best and most versatile agricultural land (grade 1, 2 and 3a) from unplanned development.  | Recognition that agricultural land has a value for farming and for wildlife.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>32</b>                                  | Biodiversity                              | A: The Local Plan needs to protect and enhance biodiversity. Have we identified the right approaches?<br><br>B: Do you think the Council should retain and update the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document?      | Include a policy for biodiversity including all the approaches outlined in issue 32 and additionally including consideration of ancient woodlands and trees.<br><br>Include the priorities set out in the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy.                                  | Reflects requirements of the NPPF that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>33</b>                                  | Green Infrastructure                      | A: Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring development to provide or contribute towards new or enhanced Green Infrastructure?<br><br>B: Are there other new Green Infrastructure projects that should be added? | Include a policy requiring development to provide or contribute towards new or enhanced Green Infrastructure. The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy should be identified in the Local Plan in order to achieve the implementation of the proposals included in this strategy. | The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that Local planning authorities set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and |

| <b>Table 5: Chapter 6 Built and Natural Environment</b> |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>                            | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|   |   |   |  | green infrastructure  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>34</b>                                  | Impact of Development in the Green Belt | Should the Local Plan include policies to ensure that development in and adjoining the Green Belt does not have an unacceptable impact on its rural character and openness?   | Include policies to ensure that development in and adjoining the Green Belt does not have an unacceptable impact on its rural character and openness.  | Will ensure development that does not impact on the character of the Green Belt.  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>35</b>                                  | Redevelopment in the Green Belt         | Regarding infilling on, or complete redevelopment of, previously developed sites in the Green Belt, should the Local Plan:<br><br>i) Rely on National Planning Policy Framework guidance for determining planning applications; or<br><br>ii) Include more detailed guidance regarding design, such as scale and height of development? | Option ii. Include a policy in the Local Plan that has detailed guidance addressing issues such as footprint, height and degree of impact from the development.  | Adding additional detail to the NPPF requirements will help to ensure qualities of the green belt are protected.  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>36</b>                                  | Green Belt and Recreation Uses          | Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring the cumulative impact of sports pitches and recreation development to be considered, to avoid the over-concentration of such sports grounds where it would be detrimental to the character and rural setting of Cambridge and Green Belt villages?                                     | Include a policy in the Local Plan requiring cumulative impact of sports pitches and recreation development to be considered to avoid overconcentration of such sports grounds which it would be to detriment to purposes of Green Belt. | With the growth proposed in the extensions around the City in the Cambridge Green Belt it is likely that land will become more intensively used, which could result in uses such as playing fields being relocated to, or specifically developed on, Green Belt land. It is important this is done in a way which protects the overall rural character of the |

| <b>Table 5: Chapter 6 Built and Natural Environment</b>                 |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>   | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|   |  |   |   | Cambridge Green Belt, rather than creating a character more associated with the urban environment.  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>37 38</b><br><br><b>I&amp;O2<br/>(Part 2)<br/>12 13</b> | Protected Village Amenity Areas and Local Green Spaces | <p>A: Should the existing policy for Protected Village Amenity Areas be retained in the Local Plan?</p> <p>B: Please provide any comments, including if there are any existing PVAAs in villages (as shown on the Proposals Map) that you think should be removed or any new ones that should be identified.</p> <p>Should the Local Plan identify any open spaces as Local Green Space and if so, what areas should be identified, including areas that may already be identified as Protected Village Amenity Areas?</p> <p>60 sites were included in the 2013 consultation for consideration as LGS. A further 9 were identified as Parish Council proposed important green spaces as these sites submitted by the Parish Councils did not meet the criteria tests for LGS. Over 200 additional sites were suggested as a result of the 2013 consultation.</p> | <p>To continue to include a policy in the plan protecting village amenity areas and also to include a policy for Local Green Space(LGS).</p> <p>A number of Local Green Spaces have been identified and included on the draft Policies Map.</p> | <p>Suggestions that only one policy be used to protect green space in villages. However some PVAAs have an important role in protecting the character of a village but may not pass the tests for to be designated as a LGS.</p> <p>Individual sites were tested to see if they met the tests for being an LGS.</p> |

| <b>Table 5: Chapter 6 Built and Natural Environment</b> |                                 |  |  |  |
|---|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>                    | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>39</b>                                  | Important Countryside Frontages | <p>Should the existing policy for Important Countryside Frontages be retained in the Local Plan?</p> <p>Please provide any comments, including if there are any existing Important Countryside Frontages in villages that you think should be removed or any new ones that should be identified.</p> | <p>A policy for Important Countryside Frontages to be included in the draft local plan</p> <p>A number of frontages were suggested across the district. Following testing a number have been included on the draft policies map.</p> | <p>In South Cambridgeshire there are many villages where land with a strong countryside character penetrates into the village or separates two parts of the built up area. Such land enhances the setting, character and appearance of the village by retaining a sense of a rural connection within a village. The frontage where this interface occurs has been identified to show that the frontage and the open countryside beyond should be kept open and free from development</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>41</b>                                  | River Cam and other waterways   | <p>Should a policy be developed for the consideration of development proposals affecting waterways, that seeks to maintain their crucial importance for drainage, whilst supporting their use as a recreation and biodiversity resource?</p>   | <p>Do not include a policy.</p>  | <p>There was a range of general comments from different organisations depending on their interest area from the primary function of the river being to prevent flooding or for biodiversity or for leisure activities. Proposed policies including for biodiversity, water quality, sustainable drainage, and green infrastructure will cover these competing demands and that a specific policy for the River Cam was therefore not necessary for</p>                                   |

| <b>Table 5: Chapter 6 Built and Natural Environment</b> |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>                                   | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |  |  |  | inclusion in the plan.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>42</b>                                  | Heritage Assets                                | <p>Taking account of the importance of the heritage asset, should the Local Plan include:</p> <p>Individual policies addressing historic landscapes; archaeological sites; listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas; or</p> <p>A single policy regarding the protection of all heritage assets</p> | Option ii. Include an overarching policy regarding the protection of all heritage assets.  | The NPPF states local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. On balance it is not considered that a suite of policies is needed to achieve appropriate protection for historic assets, and a single policy is proposed. |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>43</b>                                  | Assets of local importance                     | <p>A: Do you consider the Local Plan should protect undesignated heritage assets?</p> <p>B: If so, are there any specific buildings or other assets that should be included?</p>   | Undesignated Heritage Assets has been included in the wider heritage assets policy. This includes assets identified in conservation area appraisals, through the development process and through further supplementary planning documents. | The Council will consider identifying further undesignated heritage assets in a Supplementary Planning document. The heritage assets suggested in representations can be considered through the SPD preparation process.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>44</b>                                  | Heritage Assets and adapting to climate change | A: Should the Local Plan include a policy to provide guidance on how listed buildings and buildings in Conservation Areas can be adapted to improve their environmental performance?   | Include a policy to provide guidance on how listed buildings and buildings in Conservation Areas can be adapted to improve their environmental performance.  | The policy provides an appropriate balance to protecting heritage assets, whilst encouraging adaptation to climate change.   |

| <b>Table 5: Chapter 6 Built and Natural Environment</b> |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|   |   | B: If so, where should the balance lie between visual impact, and the benefits to energy efficiency? |   |   |
|   | Conservation Area and Green Separation between Longstanton and Northstowe | Green separation between Longstanton village and the new town of Northstowe                          | The policy should be carried forward into the new Local Plan and remain until the development of Northstowe has been completed. | The green separation between Longstanton village and the new town of Northstowe is designed to ensure the maintenance of the village character of Longstanton. It was identified through the Northstowe Area Action Plan. |

| <b>Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes</b> |                           |  |   |  |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>              | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>45</b>                                 | Housing Density           | i. Provide no specific guidance on density<br>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<br>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. | Option iii. 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. | 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 approach provides clear guidance combined with the flexibility to take into account local character, the scale of the development and other local circumstances.<br><br>Option iii acknowledges the potential for higher densities in new communities, where there can be better access to alternatives to the car, and opportunities to address design issues comprehensively.<br><br>Including no guidance what not secure the goal of making best use of land. |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>46</b>                                 | Housing Mix – House Types | i. Provide no guidance on housing mix (house types).<br>ii. Include a policy on housing mix (house types) but only for market housing.<br>iii. Any policy on housing mix (house types) should only apply to sites of 10 or more  | Option ii, iii, iv. 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  | 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.  |

| <b>Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes</b> |                    |   |  |  |
|---|--------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>       | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |                    | <p>homes.</p> <p>iv. Any policy on housing mix (house types) should seek to balance demographic trends for smaller homes with market preferences for larger homes by seeking the provision of market housing as follows:</p> <p>At least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes,</p> <p>At least 30% 3 bedroom homes</p> <p>At least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes</p> <p>With a 10% allowance for flexibility which can be added to any of the above categories taking account of local circumstances.</p> | <p>more homes, the affordable housing mix to be determined by local housing needs at the time of the development.</p>  | <p>Includes elements for flexibility, including for smaller developments.</p> <p>Providing no guidance would provide greater risk of housing needs not being met.</p>  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>47</b>                                 | Housing Mix        | <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>  | <p>Option ii. Include a policy provision requiring that all affordable housing and 5% of market housing be constructed to meet Lifetime Homes Standards.</p> | <p>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>Providing no requirement would provide greater risk of housing needs not being met.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O 1</b>  | Affordable Housing | <p>A: What target should the Local Plan include to address the need for affordable</p>  | <p>Option Ai, B. Include a policy requiring the provision of affordable housing on</p>   | <p>40% has been proven to be achievable over the majority of the</p>   |

| <b>Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes</b> |                                    |  |   |  |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>                       | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| 48  |                                    | <p>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: 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> | <p>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>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. Raising threshold slightly will support smaller developments.</p> <p>Setting a lower threshold would reduce delivery of affordable housing, and would not reflect the high level of need in the district.</p> |
| I&O 1<br>49   | Exception Sites Affordable Housing | <p>A. 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>Option Ai. 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>The inclusion of an element of market housing could be used to achieve viability. Not allowing market housing could risk viability in some circumstances, and reduce the ability to meet affordable housing needs.</p>  |

| <b>Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes</b> |                                |   |   |   |
|---|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>                   | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|   |                                | <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. 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>   |   |   |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>50</b>                                 | Residential Space Standards    | <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> | Option ii. 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. | Will help ensure new housing is able to meet needs. Not including a standard would risk delivery of poor quality housing. |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>51</b>                                 | Extensions to Dwellings in the | How do you think the Local Plan should deal with extensions to dwellings in the   | Option iii. Include a simplified less restrictive policy concerning the   | Will allow greater flexibility to consider site specific  |

| <b>Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes</b> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>                             | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|   | Countryside                              | <p>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>                                | extension of dwellings in the countryside but which retains the policy against the formation of a separate dwelling as part of the process.  | <p>circumstances. 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.</p> <p>Not including a policy would not provide appropriate guidance.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>52</b>                                 | Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside | <p>How do you think the Local Plan should address the issue of replacing existing housing in the countryside?</p> <p>i. Keep the existing policy and continue to limit replacement dwellings in the countryside to being no more than 15% larger than the dwelling they replace.</p> <p>ii. Include a less restrictive policy on replacement dwellings in the countryside.</p> | Option ii. Include a simplified less restrictive policy concerning replacement dwellings in the countryside.   | <p>Greater flexibility, but can consider other plan policies including the design policies to consider such matters as design quality, scale, local character and countryside impact.</p> <p>The 15% figure had proved too inflexible to address site specific circumstances.</p>   |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>53</b>                                 | Development of Residential Gardens       | <p>Seek to prevent the loss of residential gardens except where it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be no harm to local character.</p> <p>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>   | Option I. 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 | Proposals for the residential development of gardens in South Cambridgeshire have led to concerns including impacts on residential amenity, local character, heritage and traffic.  |

| <b>Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes</b> |  |   |   |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>                           | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |  |   | ensure that there should be no significant harm to the local area including residential amenities.  |  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>54</b>                                 | Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside | How do you think the Local Plan should address reuse of buildings in the countryside?<br><br>Not include a policy on the re-use of buildings in the countryside for residential use?<br><br>Include a policy on the re-use of buildings in the countryside for residential use setting out what factors would be taken into account.  | Option ii. 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. General support for residential development in the countryside would be unsustainable and employment uses are preferred. |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>55</b>                                 | Working at Home                        | What approach should the Local Plan take to working at home?<br><br>Not include a policy on working at home and rely on the other policies of the Local Plan and the NPPF to consider proposals.<br><br>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. | Option ii. Include a policy that would permit working at home subject to specified criteria being considered.   | Home working is growing in importance. Policy will offer greater certainty that amenity or other issues are appropriately addressed.   |
| <b>I&amp;O 1</b>  | Countryside Dwellings of               | What approach should the Local Plan take to new countryside homes of exceptional  | Option ii. Include a policy to permit countryside dwellings of exceptional  | Will add detail for consideration of proposals beyond that included in   |

| <b>Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes</b> |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
| 56  | Exceptional Quality   | <p>quality?</p> <p>Not include such a policy.</p> <p>ii) Include a policy on exceptional homes in the countryside.</p>  | <p>quality providing specified criteria are met.</p>  | <p>the NPPF, offering greater certainty that any proposals will be exceptional, and suitable for their location.</p>  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>57</b>                                 | Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation | <p>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> <p>ii) Not set a target for Travelling Showpeople occupation and rely on an additional windfall site coming forward over the plan period.</p> <p>lii) Explore with adjoining local planning authorities the extent to which local needs can be met in adjoining districts.</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</p> | <p>Option I. Set a target to provide 85 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller occupation over the period to 2031.</p> <p>Option iv. Include a policy that will seek opportunities for delivery through new communities.</p> | <p>The target reflects the findings of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment. The need has been addressed in the district through recent planning permissions.</p> <p>The Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 identified a need for 4 additional plots between 2011 and 2016 in the district for Travelling Showpeople. In order to meet the requirements of Government Policy, this has been referenced in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Seeking opportunities at new communities will enable future needs to be considered, and support the delivery of sites if they are needed.</p> |

| <b>Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes</b>                           |  |   |   |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>   | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |  | least 500 new homes.  |   |  |
| <b>Gypsy &amp; Traveller DPD: Issues and Options 2 (July 2009) - Option OPT12</b> | Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople - Windfall Sites | 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. | Include a criteria based policy to address applications for windfall sites.   | It is important that the plan includes robust, clear and positive policies for addressing applications for windfall development.   |
| <b>Gypsy &amp; Traveller DPD: Issues and Options 2 (July 2009) - Option OPT13</b> | Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople - Site Design    | Through the Gypsy and Traveller DPD Issues and Options 2 Consultation the Council considered a criteria based policy that would address design issues.  | Include a criteria based policy to address site design.   | A design policy is needed to establish standards in terms of the design and layout of new sites, in order to ensure decent and healthy accommodation.  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1 58</b>   | Dwellings to Support a Rural Based Enterprise                  | How should the Local Plan address the needs of dwellings to support rural enterprises?<br><br>Include a policy which sets out the circumstances in which it will be acceptable  | Option I. 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. | Consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), but adds additional details concerning such matters as the evidence that would be required from the applicant, any restrictions to be placed on the |

| <b>Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes</b> |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|   |   | <p>to build a new home for an employee of a rural based enterprise.</p> <p>Not include such a policy and rely upon the policy guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>   |   | <p>occupation of such dwellings and when they might be relaxed and that dwellings associated with the keeping of horses would not be appropriate.</p>   |
| <b>Issues and Options 2012 Chapter 13 –</b>             | Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton                       | 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). Planning permission has been granted. | Carry forward the existing policy for the Bayer CropScience site into the new Local Plan.   | 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. |
| <b>I&amp;O 1 112</b>                                    | Papworth West Central, Papworth Everard               | <p>How can we best invigorate Papworth Everard?</p> <p>Should the Local Plan include a specific policy to seek mixed-use development with community uses, employment and housing development?</p> <p>Or should we not include a policy and deal with individual site proposals on their merits?</p>  | Option I. 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. | Will continue to invigorate the centre of the village.  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1 112</b>                                    | Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate | <p>What approach should the Local Plan take to the Fen Drayton LSA Area?</p> <p>i) Continue to support the redevelopment of existing buildings on the</p>  | Continue to include a policy allowing the redevelopment of existing agricultural buildings for experimental and ground-breaking forms of sustainable living                               | Allows flexibility acknowledging history of the site, but reflects the countryside location. Sites are now coming forward which comply with   |

| <b>Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes</b> |  |   |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b>   | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |  | former Fen Drayton LSA site to support on-site experimental or other forms of sustainable living?<br><br>ii) How do you think the former Fen Drayton LSA should evolve?   | 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.                                    | the policy.  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>114</b>                                | Great Abington Former Land Settlement Association Estate | Question 114:<br>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? | 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.  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>114</b>                                | Linton Special Policy Area                               | Should the Local Plan continue to restrict residential development south of the A1307 at Linton?  | Include a policy restricting windfall residential development south of the A1307   | 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.   |
| <b>I&amp;O 2<br/>(part 2)<br/>9</b>                     | Residential Moorings on the River Cam                    | Site option for a residential mooring at Fen Road   | Include a site allocation for residential moorings on Chesterton Fen Road, Milton.   | 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. Environmental issues are capable of being addressed |

| <b>Table 6: Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes</b> |              |                                |                                     |                           |
|---|--------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                                     | <b>Issue</b> | <b>Alternatives Considered</b> | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b> | <b>Summary of Reasons</b> |
|   |              |                                |                                     | appropriately.            |

| <b>Table 7: Chapter 8 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy</b> |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>                            | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>59</b>   | New Employment Provision near Cambridge | Should employment provision be planned for:<br><br>i. Cambridge Northern Fringe East, and densification on the Cambridge Science Park?<br><br>ii. On new allocations on the edge of Cambridge which have previously been designated Green Belt  | Option I: Include a policy which identifies the area around the new railway station at Chesterton Sidings as an opportunity to create a high density mixed employment led development including associated supporting uses to create a vibrant new employment centre, and a policy supporting the redevelopment / intensification of Cambridge Science Park on the northern edge of Cambridge, subject to other policies in the Local Plan.<br><br>Option ii: Allocate site GB6 (Fulbourn Road) for employment use. | Including policies would reflect the needs identified in the Employment Land Review 2012.  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>60<br/><br/>I&amp;O 2<br/>(Part 2)<br/>2</b>       | Employment Allocations                  | A: Should the existing employment allocations where development is partially complete be carried forward into the Local Plan?<br><br>B: Should the existing employment allocation North of Hattons Road, Longstanton be carried forward into the Local Plan?<br><br>C: Are there any other areas that should be allocated in the Local Plan for employment? | Include the existing Employment Allocations in the new Local Plan (options A and B)<br><br>Allocate the site for redevelopment for alternative employment uses, in association with the Bourn Airfield new settlement.  | Policy for existing sites will enable their completion. They do not warrant consideration for other uses.<br><br>Hattons Road Longstanton, allocated as part of the Home Farm development and previously benefiting from planning permission including reserved matters, has not come forward, but it is near to Northstowe, and relatively near to the Guided Busway. |

| <b>Table 7: Chapter 8 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy</b> |  |   |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>   | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |  | <p>Site option at Former Thyssenkrup Plant, Bourn Airfield, Bourn.</p> <p>Other sites tested but rejected.</p>  |  | <p>Former Thyssenkrup Plant, Bourn Airfield, Bourn provides a particular opportunity as it is well related to the Bourn Airfield site, and could assist in providing employment to a new village.</p> <p>Other sites rejected for various reasons (see detailed audit trail for individual sites)</p>  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>61</b>   | Local Development Orders   | <p>A: Should the Council consider issuing Local Development Orders to help speed up employment development?</p> <p>B: If so, where?</p>   | Do not include a policy.   | This is not a matter for the Local Plan, as an LDO would be established through a separate process.  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>62</b>   | Limitations on the occupancy of New Premises in South Cambridgeshire | <p>i. Retain the current policy approach to encourage high tech research and development but offices, light industry and warehousing being small scale local provision only.</p> <p>ii. Retain the policy in its current form for specified areas:<br/>                     Cambridge Science Park<br/>                     Granta Park<br/>                     Babraham Institute</p> | Option iv. Do not include a policy on selective management of employment in the Local Plan, but include a policy restricting large scale warehousing and distribution centres. | <p>On balance the evidence suggests the benefits of removing the policy currently outweigh the costs. Responds to evidence suggesting benefits of greater flexibility.</p> <p>Large scale warehousing and distribution centres require a large land area, but generate relatively low numbers of jobs. They could quickly reduce the available land supply, and increase pressure on</p> |

| <b>Table 7: Chapter 8 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy</b> |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>                                     | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|   |  | Wellcome Trust<br>Melbourn Science Park<br>North West Cambridge (University)<br><br>iii. Amend the policy to allow for large scale, high value manufacturing and high tech headquarters to locate to South Cambridgeshire.<br><br>iv. Remove the policy apart from the restriction on large-scale warehousing and distribution.<br><br>v. Remove the policy entirely. |  | transport networks, which could harm the continued prosperity of the high technology clusters.  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>63</b>   | Promotion of Clusters                            | Should the Local Plan continue to include a policy supporting the development of clusters?  | Include a policy supporting the development of Clusters in the Local Plan.               | A specific policy is needed to reflect the needs of cluster related firms, as highlighted by the Council's Economic Development Strategy. |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>64</b>   | Shared social spaces as part of employment areas | Should the Local plan seek shared social spaces on or near employment parks?  | Include a policy supporting the development of shared social spaces on employment parks. | Evidence suggests it can benefit development of employment parks.   |
| <b>I&amp;O 1</b>  | Established Employment Areas                     | A: Should development within established employment areas in the countryside be   | Option A. Include policy in Local Plan.  | Policy identifies major employment areas, and supports their continued  |

| <b>Table 7: Chapter 8 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy</b> |                    |  |  |  |
|---|--------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>       | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| 66<br><br><b>I&amp;O 2<br/>(Part 2)<br/>3</b>                       | in the Countryside | <p>allowed?</p> <p>B: Should additional areas (both around 10 hectares), be included at:</p> <p>Eternit UK site between Meldreth and Whaddon;</p> <p>Barrington Cement Works (area of existing and former buildings)</p> <p>Revised boundary to the Granta Park Established Employment Area boundary.</p> <p>Revised boundary at Genome Campus.</p> <p>Other boundary changes tested but rejected.</p> | <p>Include the addition of the Eternit site (Bi), but not the Barrington Cement Works (Bii).</p> <p>Amend boundary at Granta Park.</p> <p>Amend boundary at Genome Campus.</p> | <p>use and adaptation.</p> <p>It is not intended to allocate additional land for employment development, or to allow sites to expand into the countryside unchecked. They have been drawn around previously developed major employment sites, or land that has been committed for development i.e. land with planning permission.</p> <p>The Eternit site is similar to a number of other sites already included in the policy.</p> <p>Barrington Cement Works does not compare with the other areas, which are in active use. Its status and as an established employment site is therefore questionable.</p> <p>Revised areas at Granta Park and Genome Campus reflect proposals which have planning permission.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O 1</b>  | New Employment     | What approach should the Local Plan take   | Option ii. Include a policy in the Local   | Thresholds provide certainty   |

| <b>Table 7: Chapter 8 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy</b> |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| 67  | Development in Villages                             | <p>to the scale of employment development in villages?</p> <p>i. Continue to restrict to small scale development (employing 25 people) and the size limitations: Offices (B1a): 400 m<sup>2</sup>, High tech / R &amp; D (B1b): 725 m<sup>2</sup>, Light Industry (B1c):800sq m<sup>2</sup>, General Industry (B2):850 m<sup>2</sup>, Warehousing (B8):1,250 m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>ii. A more flexible approach that development should be in keeping with the category, character, function and of the settlement.</p>   | Plan which supports employment development in villages which is in keeping with the category, character and function of the settlement.            | regarding scale, restricting large scale development in rural areas, but the thresholds have proven insufficiently flexible to deal with the variety of sites within the villages of the district. Other policies ensure environmental issues addressed.   |
| I&O 1<br>68   | New employment buildings on the edge of settlements | <p>A: What approach should the Local Plan take to employment development on the edges of villages?</p> <p>i. Flexibility to utilise previously developed land adjoining or very close to the village frameworks of any villages.</p> <p>ii. Flexibility to utilise green-field land <u>adjoining</u>, and logically related to the built form of the settlement of Rural, Minor Rural Centres [and Better Served Group villages if added as a new category of village – see question 13].</p> <p>B: Should applicants be required to demonstrate there is a lack of suitable buildings and sites within the settlement?</p> | Option Aii and B. Include a policy enabling employment development on the edges of villages, with appropriate criteria to address adverse impacts. | <p>The policy would enable the re-use of previously developed land, but where this is not possible would enable the use of greenfield land in appropriate circumstances. This additional flexibility will help support the rural economy, and provide additional flexibility to support the needs of businesses.</p> <p>Environmental issues addressed by other policies. It is reasonable to seek to ensure alternatives have been fully explored before development on greenfield land on the edges of villages is considered.</p> |

| <b>Issue Number</b>     | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>69</b> | Extensions to existing businesses in the countryside        | <p>What approach should be taken to extension of existing businesses in the countryside?</p> <p>i. continue to apply a generally restrictive approach, where proposals would have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances; or</p> <p>ii. support expansion of existing firms where schemes are of an appropriate scale, do not have an adverse effect in terms of character and amenity, and can be justified through submission of a business case.</p> | Option ii. Include a policy which supports expansion of existing firms, where schemes are of an appropriate scale, do not have an adverse impact in terms of character and amenity, and can be justified through submission of a business case (subject to the requirements of Green Belt policy). | <p>The NPPF requires plans to support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings.</p> <p>A generally restrictive approach would not support existing businesses, and would be overly restrictive.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>70</b> | Conversion or Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment | <p>A: Should the Local Plan should continue to prioritise employment uses for rural buildings where traffic generation is not a problem?</p> <p>B: Should the Local Plan support extensions where they enhance the design and are not out of scale and character with the location.</p>   | Option A and B. Include a policy in the Local Plan which continues to support the reuse of rural buildings for economic purposes. Amend policy to be supportive of extension where it would enhance the design and not be out of scale and character with the location.                            | The NPPF requires a positive approach to support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings.  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>71</b> | Farm Diversification  | Do you agree that the Local Plan should continue to support farm diversification?   | Include a policy in the local plan supporting farm diversification.  | Agriculture is an important sector in South Cambridgeshire, and diversification can help to support working farms. There are sufficient controls, including through other policies, to ensure a scheme is   |

| <b>Table 7: Chapter 8 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy</b> |                               |   |   |  |
|---|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>                  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |                               |   |   | appropriate to the location.   |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>72</b>   | Retention of Employment Sites | <p>A: Should the Local Plan continue to resist the loss of employment land to alternative uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. in villages only</li> <li>ii. include areas outside frameworks on the edges of villages.</li> </ul> <p>B: Should the Local Plan include the alternative more detailed tests in Issue 72 for determining when alternative use of an employment site should be permitted?</p> | <p>Option Aii. Maintain a policy which protects employment land in villages, and extend to include sites on the edges of villages.</p> <p>B. Include additional details to make the marketing element of the tests more robust.</p> | Evidence highlights the importance of maintaining employment land to the sustainability of villages. There are important employment sites on the edges of villages where the loss would have similar negative impacts to sites inside a village framework. The policy should therefore be widened to encompass areas outside frameworks on the edges of villages. Tests have been reviewed to provide clarity but remain reasonable. |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>73</b>   | Tourist Accommodation         | <p>A: Should appropriately scaled development for visitor and holiday accommodation in villages, and the conversion or redevelopment of rural buildings in the countryside be supported?</p> <p>B: Should the Local Plan provide greater flexibility for new visitor accommodation by allowing redevelopment of any previously developed land in the countryside for small scale holiday and visitor accommodation?</p>   | Option A. Include policy which enables appropriately scaled tourist accommodation within settlements, but generally restricts development in the countryside to reuse of existing buildings.  | <p>The NPPF requires support for sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside.</p> <p>There is already flexibility in current policies to support tourism development in the countryside, focused on farm diversification, and re-use / replacement of appropriate</p>                                    |

| <b>Table 7: Chapter 8 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy</b> |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>                               | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |  |  |  | buildings. Allowing development of previously developed land in the countryside for small scale visitor accommodation would increase flexibility, but it could result in the proliferation of residential units in the countryside, which could impact on rural character, and sustainability. |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>74</b>   | Tourist facilities and visitor attractions | A: Should the Local Plan contain a policy supporting the development of appropriate tourist facilities and visitor attractions?<br><br>B: Could these be located in the countryside?   | Option A and B. Include a policy in the Local plan which supports development of tourist facilities utilising and enhancing the areas existing tourism assets.                 | The importance of tourism was recognised in representations, but also concern that development should be of a sustainable scale, and not cause harm to the landscape and the assets of the district. The policy aims to achieve an appropriate balance.  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>75</b>   | Retail Hierarchy                           | Where should new retail and service provision occur?<br><br>i. New retail provision and main town centre uses should be in scale with the position of the centre in the retail hierarchy as follows:<br>Town centres: Northstowe;<br>Rural Centres village centres;<br>All other villages. | Option I. Carry forward hierarchy into the new Local Plan. Note: If new settlements allocated in the plan, they would need to be added at appropriate levels to the hierarchy. | Important for maintaining vitality and viability of centres.   |

| <b>Table 7: Chapter 8 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy</b> |  |  |   |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>                               | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |  | ii. New facilities should be provided differently – if so, how?  |   |  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>76</b>   | Assessing the Impact of Retail Development | <p>What should be the floorspace threshold above which retail impact assessments are required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. 2500m<sup>2</sup> - large superstore</li> <li>ii. 500m<sup>2</sup> - village scale supermarket</li> <li>iii. 250m<sup>2</sup> - typical village shop</li> </ul> | Option ii/iii. Include a threshold for retail impact assessments of 500m <sup>2</sup> in the village centres of Rural Centres, and 250m <sup>2</sup> elsewhere. | There was significant support for having a lower threshold than the default set by the NPPF of 2,500m <sup>2</sup> . An impact assessment does not preclude development; it ensures any significant impacts are identified. In village centres of rural centres, the larger scale supermarkets of up to 500m <sup>2</sup> would be appropriate, but it would be appropriate to test the impact of larger stores. Outside these areas and in smaller villages, a lower threshold of 250m <sup>2</sup> would be appropriate, as a larger store could impact on the viability of village centres. |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>77</b>   | Meeting Retail Needs                       | Question 77: Should the Informal Planning Policy Guidance on foodstore provision in North West Cambridge should be reflected in the new Local Plan?  | Do not include a policy on north west Cambridge in the Local Plan.  | The retail referred to in the informal policy has now largely gained planning permission.  |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>78</b>   | Village Shops and Related Local Services   | Do you think that the Local Plan should support development of new or improved village shops and local services of an appropriate size related to the scale and function of the village?   | Include a policy supporting the development of village shops and services of an appropriate size related to the scale and function of the village.              | Supports village shops and services of an appropriate size to the scale and function of the village. This is important to help support accessibility of services,  |

| <b>Table 7: Chapter 8 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy</b> |  |  |   |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>                                     | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |  |  |   | and maintain the sustainability of village   |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>79</b>   | Retailing in the Countryside                     | Do you think that retail development in the countryside should be restricted?<br>As described.<br>To include additional facilities.  | Option I. Include a policy in the new Local Plan restricting retail development in the countryside.   | Sporadic development of retail in the countryside could support unsustainable patterns of development, and undermine village and town centres. However, there are some retail uses that need a countryside location and can support the rural economy. |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>111</b>  | Papworth Hospital site, Papworth Everard         | What should the Papworth Hospital site be used for when the hospital relocates to Addenbrooke's?<br>A preference for continuation of healthcare on the site, and only if a suitable user cannot be found, other employment uses compatible with adjoining residential;<br>Employment uses that would be compatible with adjoining residential;<br>Housing led development, including mixed uses. | Option I. Continue to include a policy allowing the Papworth Hospital site to be redeveloped and including a sequential approach with the preferred uses being i. healthcare and ii. employment.  | The loss of employment from the hospital site would have a significant impact on the economy of the village, and the ability of people to find work locally.   |
| <b>I&amp;O 1<br/>116</b>  | The Imperial War Museum site at Duxford Airfield | Should the Local Plan maintain the approach to development at the Imperial War Museum at Duxford, that it must be associated with the continued use of the site as a museum of aviation and modern conflict?   | Continue to include a policy that allows the Imperial War Museum at Duxford to be treated as a special case given to its national significance, but amend the existing adopted policy to be more flexible on the uses that will be permitted. | Amending the policy to include more flexibility over the uses that would be permitted on the site will ensure that the vitality and sustainability of the site is assured and the Imperial War Museum can  |

| <b>Table 7: Chapter 8 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy</b> |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in draft Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |   |   | The policy must ensure that details of projected increases in noise are provided with all proposals which would lead to an increase in commercial or flying activity.   | make good use of their assets.   |
| <b>I&amp;O 2 (Part 2) 4</b>   | Parish Council Proposal for 'Station', Histon and Impington | Proposal by Histon and Impington Parish Council for 'Station' in Histon and Impington   | Include a policy in the Local Plan for mixed-use development in the 'Station' area of Histon and Impington.   | Will enable redevelopment of the area to enhance the village.  |
|   | Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals Site                      | A policy allowing the redevelopment of the Ida Darwin Hospital and Fulbourn Hospital sites for residential development and new mental health facilities was originally included in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document (adopted January 2010). | Carry forward the existing policy into the new Local Plan but remove the references to Policy GB/4 of the Development Control Policies DPD which designated the site as a major developed site in the Green Belt. | Provides a framework for the site as it comes forward for development. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector. |

| <b>Issue Number</b>    | <b>Issue</b>                                  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>40</b> | Community Orchards and Allotments             | Should the Local Plan seek to encourage the creation of community orchards, new woodland areas or allotments in or near to villages and protect existing ones?   | Include in the Local Plan policies which seek to encourage the creation of community orchards, new woodland areas or allotments in or near to villages and to protect existing ones.  | They provide a range of benefits, including biodiversity, landscape enhancement, and fruit for local communities and a catalyst for the community to come together.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>80</b> | Health Impact Assessment                      | A: Should the Local Plan continue to seek Health Impact Assessments (HIA) to accompany major development proposals?<br>B: Should the threshold when HIA are required:<br>i. Remain at 20 or more dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> floorspace; or<br>ii. Be raised to 100 or more dwellings, or 5,000m <sup>2</sup> floorspace.   | Option A, Bi. Continue to include a policy to seek Health Impact Assessments retaining the existing threshold of 20 or more dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> , but the wording should state that a HIA is required that is appropriate to the scale of the development.   | By allowing flexibility within the policy this will allow for different levels of detail within HIA depending on the scale of the development. A rapid impact assessment could pick up if a small development is having a greater impact than expected and allows for more detail assessment to be carried out.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>81</b> | Protection of Village Services and Facilities | A: Should the Local Plan seek to continue to protect where possible local services and facilities such as village shops, pubs, post offices, libraries, community meeting places, health centres or leisure facilities?<br><br>B: Are there any other services and facilities that should be included?<br><br>C: Should the Local Plan include the alternative more detailed and stringent tests | Option A, B,C. To continue to include a policy in the Local Plan protecting village services and facilities but to make some amendments to it such as widening the range of services covered by it and to amend the tests that will be used.<br><br>In order for more services to be included within the scope of the policy the following have been included:<br><br>Add 'banks' which are currently not included. | By including a policy in the Local Plan the Council is recognising the importance of retaining services within a village and their value as meeting places. The tests provide a reasonable balance, providing opportunities for services to be retained, whilst allowing there loss when this is appropriately demonstrated not to be possible or appropriate |

| <b>Table 8: Chapter 9 Successful Communities</b>                        |  |   |   |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>   | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |  | <p>proposed in Issue 81 for determining when an alternative use should be permitted?</p> <p>D: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?</p>  | <p>Change 'community meeting places' to 'community buildings and meeting places' – this would then include youth centres / scout huts / religious establishments.</p> <p>Change 'health centres' to 'health facilities' – this would then cover doctors' surgery, dentists.</p> |  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>82</b>  | Developing New Communities   | <p>A: Do you agree with the principles of service provision in Issue 82?</p> <p>B: If not, why not? What alternative issues do you think should be included?</p>  | The Local Plan should be based on the principles for service and facility provision as set out in Issue 82. Consideration should be given to existing residents from an area when developing a new community.   | Important the needs of new communities are fully considered.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>83, 85,<br/>86<br/><br/>I&amp;O2<br/>(Part 1)<br/>8</b> | Provision of sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities, Ice Rink and Concert Hall | <p>Question 83:</p> <p>A: Is there a need for any other sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities that should be considered through the Local Plan Review?</p> <p>B: If there is a need, what type and size of facility should they be?</p> <p>C: If there is a need, where is the most appropriate location?</p> <p>Question 85:</p> <p>A: Is there a need for an ice rink in or near</p> | Do not include a policy, but instead provide supporting text.   | There are a number of facilities some of sub regional significance, which have struggled to find space within Cambridge. Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council recognise that delivering such facilities within the sub-region is desirable, but are not satisfied that a compelling case exists for the need for a community stadium or other facilities in a Green Belt location. Any proposals would be considered on an exceptional basis, and would have to demonstrate there is a need, |

| <b>Table 8: Chapter 9 Successful Communities</b> |                   |   |   |  |
|--|-------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                              | <b>Issue</b>      | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b> | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|  |                   | <p>to Cambridge?</p> <p>B: If there is a need, where should it be located?</p> <p>Question 86:</p> <p>A: Is there a need for a concert hall in or near to Cambridge?</p> <p>B: If there is a need, where should it be located?</p> <p>Issues and options 2013 (Part 1)</p> <p>Question 8:</p> <p>A: Rather than identifying specific sites, should the Local Plans include a general policy to assist the consideration of any proposals for sub regional facilities such as ice rinks and concert halls, should they come forward?</p> <p>B: Are the right principles identified? If not, what should be included?</p> |   | <p>and they comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular the sequential approach to town centre uses, and other policies in the Local Plan.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>84<br/>I&amp;O2</b>              | Community Stadium | <p>Question 84:</p> <p>Is there a need for a community stadium?</p> <p>If there is a need, what type and size of facility should it be, and where is the most</p>   | Do not allocate a site for a community stadium.   | Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council do not consider that objective, up to date evidence of need for a community stadium has been            |

| <b>Table 8: Chapter 9 Successful Communities</b> |              |  |   |  |
|--|--------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                              | <b>Issue</b> | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b> | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>(Part 1)<br/>4 to 7</b>                       |              | <p>appropriate location?</p> <p>Question 4:<br/>Do you think there is a need for a community stadium serving the sub-region?</p> <p>Question 5:<br/>Do you agree with the principles identified for the vision for a community stadium?</p> <p>Question 6:<br/>If a suitable site cannot be found elsewhere, do you think the need is sufficient to provide exceptional circumstances for a review of the Green Belt to accommodate a community stadium?</p> <p>Question 7:<br/>Which if any of the following site options for a community stadium do you support or object to, and why? - Site Options CS1 to CS9</p> |   | <p>demonstrated.</p> <p>A review of evidence (Major Facilities Sub Regional Facilities in the Cambridge Area - Review of Evidence and Site Options) concluded that demonstrable need is a subjective issue, and should be tested further through public consultation, particularly as public consultation did not form part of previous studies.</p> <p>There are potential benefits to a community stadium scheme, highlighted by the studies, but the Councils have to make a judgement whether the need has been demonstrated, and in particular whether need is sufficient to provide exceptional circumstances for a review of the Green Belt. It is not considered that the need is sufficient to justify a Green Belt review, particularly given the harmful impacts identified of the sites tested.</p> <p>Through the plan making process</p> |

| <b>Table 8: Chapter 9 Successful Communities</b> |                      |  |   |  |
|--|----------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                              | <b>Issue</b>         | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|  |                      |  |   | the Councils sought to identify potential site options that could accommodate a community stadium. A range of options were considered before 9 options were identified. Two sites were suggested to the Council were included in the public consultation. All presented significant challenges, and do not warrant allocation. |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>87</b>                           | Open Space Standards | A: Should the Local Plan continue to include a policy for open space provision?<br>B: Do you agree with the standards of provision listed in Issue 87 that is similar to the current adopted policy?<br>C: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included? | Continue to include a policy for open space provision using the standards set out in Issue 87.  | The standard is appropriate for the district based on local open space needs assessment.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>88</b>                           | Allotments           | A: Should major new housing developments include provision of allotments?<br>B: Do you agree with the standard of provision proposed in Issue 88?<br>C: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?  | Option B. Include allotment and community orchard provision within the relevant open space policies to ensure sites are included in major new housing developments using the standard of around 32 allotments per 1,000 households. | Wide support for including allotments within a policy in the Local Plan and using the standard which is one used by Cambridge City Council, and follows research into supply and demand through the Audit and Assessment of need for open space.   |

| <b>Table 8: Chapter 9 Successful Communities</b>            |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>                               | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>89</b>                                      | Standards for On-Site Open space Provision | A: Do you agree the thresholds for when on-site open space will be required in new developments?<br><br>B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included? | Option A. Include a policy stating the thresholds that will be required in new developments for on-site open space.  | Thresholds ensure meaningful and useable spaces are delivered on site, rather than small sites that would not function for the uses proposed and could be problematic to manage. They are tried and tested locally, as they form part of the current open space SPD. Where provision is not provided on site contributions will be made through s106 or CIL. |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>90<br/><br/>I&amp;O2<br/>(part2)<br/>11</b> | Allocations for Open Space                 | A: Should the Local Plan carry forward the existing allocations for recreation and open space?<br><br>B: Are there other areas that should be allocated?   | Carry forward:<br>East of recreation ground, Over North of Hatton's Road, Longstanton<br>North of recreation ground, Swavesey<br>East of Bar Lane & north-west of Green Hedge Farm, Stapleford<br><br>Add:<br>Land known as Bypass Farm, West of Cottenham Road, Histon<br>East of Railway Line, South of Granhams Road, Great Shelford<br>Grange Field, Church Street, Great Shelford | Sites are suitable for open space uses, and supported by relevant Parish Councils. They are located in villages where a need for open space exists against the standards.<br><br>Other sites have either been completed or are no longer supported by the Parish Council.  |

| <b>Table 8: Chapter 9 Successful Communities</b> |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                              | <b>Issue</b>                            | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|  |   |   | Do not carry forward:<br>East of recreation ground, Impington<br>Land at Primary School, Long Furlong, Over<br>East of Mill Lane, Impington<br>Land at Barrowcroft, Gunns Lane, Histon  |   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>91</b>                           | Protection of Existing Recreation Areas | A: Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking to protect existing playing fields and recreation facilities?<br><br>B: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included. | Option A. Protect existing playing fields and recreation facilities since they are recognised as being important facilities within a community and once lost cannot easily be replaced. The scope of this policy to be widened to include the future protection of allotments and community orchards which are recognised as valuable green assets in a settlement. | Need to protect open space as vulnerable asset given their potential value as development land. |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>92</b>                           | Indoor Community Facilities             | A: Should the Local Plan include a policy for indoor community space provision?<br><br>B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?                                     | Option A. Include a policy including the standard for indoor community space provision and a higher standard for new communities.   | Importance of community indoor space - it is a vital commodity and should be protected.         |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>93</b>                           | Lighting, noise and odour issues        | A: Should the Local Plan include policies dealing with lighting, noise, and odour issues?<br><br>B: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?                       | Option A. Retain the existing policies dealing with lighting, noise and odour issues and to revise according to changes in guidance and legislation where appropriate.  | Important issue that impacts on the quality of life of the district.                            |

| <b>Table 8: Chapter 9 Successful Communities</b> |                          |   |  |  |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                              | <b>Issue</b>             | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>94</b>                           | Contaminated land        | A: Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking appropriate investigation and remediation of contaminated land?<br><br>B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included? | Option A. Include a policy seeking appropriate investigation and remediation of contaminated land.           | Important issue to protect health and the environment.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>95</b>                           | Air Quality              | A: Should the Local Plan include a policy dealing with air quality?<br><br>B: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?   | Option A. Include a policy dealing with air quality.   | Policies are needed to consider the impact of development proposals on air quality, and ensure development is not subject to poor air quality.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>96</b>                           | Low Emissions Strategies | A: Should the Local Plan include a requirement for Low Emissions Strategies?<br><br>B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?                                      | Option A. Include a requirement for Low Emissions Strategies to be incorporated into the air quality policy. | The main benefit of low emission strategies is to reduce transport emissions by accelerating the uptake of low emission fuels and technologies in and around a new development, and to promote modal shift away from car travel. |
|  | Hazardous Installations  | N/A   | Include a policy to ensure Hazardous installations are appropriately considered in planning decisions.       | A requirement of planning guidance and legislation.  |
| <b>I&amp;O2<br/>(part2)<br/>8</b>                | Hospice Provision        | Are there any sites which might be suitable for allocation for new hospice provision?   | Include a criteria based policy in the Local Plan.   | A suitable site has not been identified through the plan making process, therefore a criteria based policy is a suitable way for the plan  |

| <b>Table 8: Chapter 9 Successful Communities</b> |                                 |  |  |  |
|--|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>                              | <b>Issue</b>                    | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>      | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|  |                                 |  |  | to address this issue.   |
| <b>I&amp;O2 (part2) 10</b>                       | Provision of New Burial Grounds | Do you own land that could provide suitable new burial ground facilities to meet needs over the next 20 years for:<br>A: Gamlingay<br>B: Hauxton             | Do not include specific allocations in the local plan. | Gamlingay has now identified a site outside the plan making process. A suitable site at Hauxton has not been identified.   |
| <b>Additional Single Issue Consultation 2013</b> | Sawston Stadium Proposal        | Should the Local Plan allocate the site north of Dales Manor Business Park, Babraham Road Sawston, for a football stadium with associated public open space? | Do not include an allocation in the Local Plan.        | There is not currently sufficient certainty that environmental impacts of the site can be satisfactorily addressed. In addition it is not considered that the need is sufficient to warrant its removal from the Green Belt, and development that would harm the purposes of the Green Belt and access through adjoining local residential roads would not be desirable. |

| <b>Table 9: Chapter 10 Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure</b> |  |  |   |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>                           | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>65</b>  | Broadband                              | Do you think that the Local Plan should include a policy seeking provision for broadband infrastructure in new developments?   | Include a policy requiring new development to contribute towards the provision of infrastructure suitable to enable the delivery of high speed broadband services across the district.  | Broadband is considered an important infrastructure element in the District, highlighted by the Council's Economic Development Strategy.   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>97</b>  | Planning for more Sustainable Travel   | Should the Local Plan include the principles regarding sustainable travel in outlined in Issue 97, and are there any additional issues that should be included?  | Include a policy on Planning for Sustainable Travel in the Local Plan encompassing the principles in Issue 97 and incorporating the overall aim of reducing the need to travel.   | To ensure development is located in the most appropriate locations, minimising, wherever possible, the need to travel to meet day to day needs. Whilst travel options may be more limited for rural areas, often due to greater distances to travel and/or less infrastructure and availability, the objective should remain as providing travel choice to the nearest centres with facilities and services, and evidence shows people are increasingly using sustainable modes. |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>98</b>  | Transport Assessments and Travel Plans | A: Should the Local Plan continue to require 'major developments' to produce a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, as well as smaller developments with particular transport implications?<br><br>B: Should an alternative threshold be used, if so what, and why? | Option A. Include within the planning for sustainable travel policy a requirement for development to mitigate its travel impacts, and require larger developments and developments with significant traffic impacts to provide a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, with smaller developments providing a Transport Statement. | Important for addressing travel impacts. Includes flexibility to deal with smaller developments.   |

| <b>Table 9: Chapter 10 Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure</b> |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>                                | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>99</b>  | Car Parking within Residential Developments | <p>A: What approach should the Local Plan take towards residential car parking standards? (note – all options are subject to achieving appropriate highway safety)</p> <p>i. Maximum parking standards - an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling, up to a maximum of 2 spaces per 3 or more bedrooms in poorly accessible areas.</p> <p>ii. Maximum parking standards - an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling for developments on the edge of Cambridge, but increase to an average of 2 spaces per dwelling across the remainder of district, with an average of 2.5 spaces per 3 or more bedrooms in poorly accessible areas.</p> <p>iii. Remove all car parking standards and adopt a design-led approach to car parking provision in new developments.</p> <p>B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p> | <p>Include a parking provision policy setting out car and cycle parking standards in new developments. The policy will include indicative car parking standards and minimum cycle parking standards, with developers required to demonstrate appropriate provision through a design-led approach.</p> <p>Residential car parking standard raised to 2 spaces per dwelling.</p> | <p>To reflect the increasing levels of car ownership and the existing problems caused by insufficient car parking. In conjunction with the Design Principles policy, it should allow for innovative design solutions where the car can be accommodated within developments instead of dominating them. The policy continues to provide flexibility to reduce the amount of car parking through the use of shared parking and other smart measures, such as car clubs.</p> <p>Removing standards would enable a greater risk of provision either being too high or too low.</p> |

| <b>Table 9: Chapter 10 Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure</b> |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>100</b>   | Allocation of Car Parking within Residential Developments | <p>A: What approach should the Local Plan take to the allocation of car parking spaces in residential developments?</p> <p>i. The Local Plan should maximise the efficiency of car parking provision by not allocating any residential car parking to individual properties.</p> <p>ii. The Local Plan should only allocate a proportion of the car parking spaces to individual properties.</p> <p>iii. The Local Plan should not address the allocation of parking spaces, and it should be left to the design of individual developments.</p> <p>B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p> | Option ii. Include within the parking provision policy a requirement that within residential developments at least one car parking space is allocated per property within the curtilage. | The policy provides flexibility to allow developers to demonstrate through a design-led approach, in conjunction with the overall level of provision, how best to accommodate car parking within the development. This will be delivered in conjunction with the Design Principles policy. There is however, a requirement that in residential developments at least one car can be parked within the curtilage. |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>101</b>   | Residential Garages                                       | <p>What approach should the Local Plan take to residential garages?</p> <p>i. Specify minimum size dimensions for garages to count towards parking</p>  | Option I. Include within the parking provision policy the specification that only garages over the minimum size can count towards car parking provision.                                 | Where Garages count towards car parking provision the policy ensures they are a suitable size to be fit for purpose, particularly if they are being used for cycle parking as well.  |

| <b>Table 9: Chapter 10 Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure</b> |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>   | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>   | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>   |
|   |   | standards, to ensure they are large enough to easily accommodate modern cars, cycles and other storage needs; or<br><br>ii. Not address the issue of residential garage sizes. |   | Not addressing the issue would risk inadequate parking arrangements.  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>102</b>   | Car Parking Standards for Other Types of Developments | Should the Local Plan carry forward the maximum parking standards for non-residential development included in its existing plan?   | Include a parking provision policy setting out car and cycle parking standards in new developments. | Non-residential car parking is also an important 'tool' in encouraging sustainable travel as part of the Travel Plan. The policy provides flexibility to allow developers to demonstrate through a design-led approach, in conjunction with the overall level of provision, how best to accommodate car parking within the development. |

| <b>Table 9: Chapter 10 Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure</b> |                           |   |  |  |
|---|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>              | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>103</b>   | Cycle Parking Standards   | <p>A: What approach should the Local Plan take towards cycle parking standards?</p> <p>Retain the current minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development.</p> <p>Continue to set minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development, but develop new higher levels of provision.</p> <p>Remove cycle parking standards, but include a policy requiring cycle parking provision, adopting a design-led approach</p> <p>B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p> | <p>Include a parking provision policy setting out car and cycle parking standards in new developments. Include minimum cycle parking standards. Include higher standards.</p>                                | <p>The policy raises the residential cycle parking standard to one space per bedroom and allows flexibility for how cycle parking can be accommodated within developments.</p> <p>Removing standards would risk a lower than desirable level of provision, which could hamper promotion of cycling as a sustainable means of travel.</p> |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>104</b>   | Rail Freight Interchanges | <p>Should the Local Plan continue to protect rail freight interchange sites?</p> <p>Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p>  | <p>Include a policy in the Local Plan to permit the development of rail freight interchanges where they accord with other policies in the Plan and safeguarding existing freight sites for this purpose.</p> | <p>Continuing to protect rail freight interchange sites encourages the modal shift of freight from road to rail and reduce the number of heavy lorries on the roads, reduce congestion, improve safety and cut emissions.</p>  |
| <b>I&amp;O1</b>   | Airfields and public      | A: Should the Local Plan continue to  | Include an aviation related development  | There are a number of established  |

| <b>Table 9: Chapter 10 Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure</b> |  |   |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>                             | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
| <b>105</b>  | safety zones                             | include a criteria-based policy for assessing and mitigating the impact of aviation related development proposals?<br><br>B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?  | policy in the Local Plan setting out the criteria for assessing the potential impacts of new aviation proposals and ensure, where necessary, appropriate conditions are applied.                         | aerodromes and smaller airfields in the district. Aviation contributes to national, regional and local economies and there are a number of industries established on local airfields. However, airfields can raise environmental issues, which need careful consideration to balance the different interests that can be in conflict. In particular, noise resulting from flying activities has been a source of complaints in the past and is still a very sensitive issue in some areas of the district. |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>106</b>   | Cambridge Airport – Aviation Development | A: Should the Local Plan include a policy that would only permit aviation development at Cambridge Airport where it would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity?<br><br>B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included? | Include a policy for Cambridge Airport to restrict development within the Public Safety Zone in order to minimise the number of people at risk in the event of an aircraft crash on take-off or landing. | Government policy identifies a Public Safety Zone at Cambridge Airport, which should be identified and safeguarded in the Local Plan   |
| <b>I&amp;O1<br/>107</b>   | Provision of Infrastructure and Services | A: Should the Local Plan include a policy to require development to provide appropriate infrastructure?   | Include a comprehensive policy in the Local Plan requiring development to improve or make provision for infrastructure and services, including provision for their                                       | Development should provide the necessary infrastructure to ensure it mitigates its own impacts and is acceptable in planning terms.  |

| <b>Table 9: Chapter 10 Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure</b> |                              |   |  |  |
|---|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Issue</b>                 | <b>Alternatives Considered</b>  | <b>Approach in Proposed Submission Local Plan</b>  | <b>Summary of Reasons</b>  |
|   |                              | B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?                          | <p>future maintenance and upkeep, compatible with the nature and scale of development. The policy wording will need to be able to accommodate the future introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy and allow for cross-boundary issues to be addressed.</p> <p>Include a policy on education facilities requiring the pressures on school places to be taken into account and, where appropriate, provision of new or enhanced facilities.</p> | Cambridgeshire County Council has raised specific concerns relating to pressures on school places and would like the inclusion of an education policy in the Local Plan. |
|   | Lords Bridge Radio Telescope | The international importance of the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge must be safeguarded. | Carry forward the existing policy into the new Local Plan.   | To protect the operation of the telescope.   |