Chapter 10: Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">Paragraphs 10.1 - 10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Submission Representations Received</td>
<td>Total: 6
Support: 0
Object: 6 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Issues</td>
<td>Object

English Heritage – Priority should be given to solutions that take account of the historic environment.
Ickleton PC – Include new cycle and footpaths to the village.
St Edmundsbury BC - Plan weakened by lack of reference to delivering aspirations of emerging Transport Strategy.
Growth strategy reliant on significant improvements in public transport and deliverability depends on availability, level and timing of public funding. Large gap in funding and cost. Identify sites less reliant on improvements to ensure deliverability.
Little about railways, except Chesterton Station.
Little money for roads or to address congestion on A505.

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>The Transport Strategy and Local Plan were prepared in parallel to ensure development is located in sustainable locations and mitigation and infrastructure requirements necessary to promote sustainable travel are included in the Local Plan. Concentrating new development can also help address existing transport conditions, including congestion, by maximising developer funding.

Policy TI/2 encourages travel by all sustainable modes, including rail, and outlines a series of measures to facilitate this. It is not appropriate for the Local Plan to list specific schemes, which would be a matter for the Local Transport Plan. Protection of the historic environment is addressed by other policies in the Plan, notably in Chapter 6.

Minor changes are proposed to acknowledge the importance of rail, and to delivering the aspirations of transport plans / strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach in Submission Local Plan</td>
<td>Minor change

Add to the end of paragraph 10.2:
'…The Local Plan will assist with the delivery of requirements and aspirations within current and emerging transport plans and strategies.'</td>
</tr>
</table>

	Add an additional paragraph after 10.4 (and renumber the remaining paragraphs): **'A few rural parts of the district are well served by rail, for example the A10 corridor both north and south of Cambridge, while others rely on the markets towns and Cambridge for access to the railway network. Improved access to stations and interchanges, for example improved cycle access via cycle path networks or quiet routes, can help encourage more people to cycle and more people to travel by train rather than car. In Cambridge, the new Science Park Station and Interchange will contribute to the growth of rail use and will be essential to provide interchange facilities.'** Add a new bullet to the key facts after the 5th bullet: **'A few rural parts of the district, for example the A10 corridor both north and south of Cambridge, are well served by rail, while others rely on the markets towns and Cambridge for access to the railway network.'**

Policy TI/1: Chesterton Rail Station and Interchange

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see audit trail for Policy SS/4: Cambridge Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station which is included in Chapter 3 (Strategic Sites).

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Policy TI/1: Chesterton Rail Station and Interchange</td></tr>
<tr><td>Proposed Submission Representations Received</td><td>Total: 5
Support: 5
Object: 0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Main Issues</td><td>Support
• Natural England – Welcome the requirement for development to protect Jersey Cudweed.
• New station is fundamental to redevelopment of the Northern Fringe East and will benefit all of northern Cambridge / region.
• Opportunity to enable greater use of the railway, an underused means of transport, and a corridor capable of carrying an increased modal share in the area.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assessment</td><td>Representations support the policy.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Approach in Submission Local Plan</td><td>No change</td></tr>
</table>

Policy TI/2: Planning for Sustainable Travel

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 97	Planning for more Sustainable Travel
Key evidence	Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan
Existing policies	• Development Control Policies DPD: Planning for More Sustainable Travel (TR/1) • Development Control Policies DPD: Mitigating Travel Impact (TR/3) • Development Control Policies DPD: Non-motorised Modes (TR/4)
Analysis	The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 30) states 'Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.' 'Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in this Framework, particularly in rural areas.' (paragraph 34) 'Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable modes for the movement of goods or people. Therefore, developments should be located and designed where practical to • Accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies; • Give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities; • Create safe and secure layouts which minimize conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians, avoiding street clutter and where appropriate establishing home zones; • Incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra low emission vehicles; and • Consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.' (paragraph 35) 'Planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths…' (paragraph 37) The rural nature of the district means that many people need to travel long distances to meet their day to day needs. South

Cambs has a high rate of car ownership and many are using their cars, as distances are often too great to walk and cycle, and public transport services are often limited or inaccessible. However, short trips of less than two miles make up over 25% of trips, therefore there is an opportunity to target some of these to be made on foot or on bicycle. Even for longer trips there is the opportunity to make part of the journey by a sustainable mode, for example, cycling from Park & Ride sites.

The Local Plan Strategy should ensure development is located in the most appropriate locations, minimizing, wherever possible, the need to travel to meet day to day needs.

The current policy seeks to maximize potential for modal choice, both within and outside the development. Other policy (TR/3) also requires development to mitigate its impact and this can be addressed, at least in part, by a Travel Plan which can include a number of measures for increasing modal choice, including addressing behavioural choices as well as through provision of new and/or improved infrastructure.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

Current policy adheres to Government guidance which requires the Council to protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable modes for the movement of goods or people.

Issue 97 sets out a number of principles for sustainable travel including improving and maximising opportunities for modal choice, fully addressing impacts of travel, with particular emphasis on non-car modes:
- Developments should not be approved that are likely to give a significant increase in travel demands, unless the site has or can provide sufficient standard of accessibility, offers an appropriate level of travel choice by walking, cycling or public transport.

- Developments should be expected to address the transport issues they generate, such as through improvements to provide safe road access, improvements to the road, footway or cycleway network, or to address environmental impacts such as noise or air quality. This could be through the direct provision of transport infrastructure through the development, or financial contributions through planning obligations or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), to address transport infrastructure in the wider area.

	• Development can provide opportunities to encourage sustainable travel, and, in particular, increase the use of non-car modes (public transport, walking and cycling), by providing safe, direct routes that offer people real travel choice for some or all of their journey. Developers should be expected to demonstrate they have maximised opportunities to integrate travel modes, and access by non-motorised modes. • New cycle and walking routes should connect to existing networks, strengthening connections between clusters of villages, and Northstowe, Cambridge, and market towns. • In a rural area like South Cambridgeshire, the wider Rights of Way network provides an important resource for walkers, and in some cases, for cyclists and horse riders. As well as providing links between villages, they offer leisure and recreation routes improving access to the surrounding countryside as part of a healthy lifestyle. Developments should protect such routes, and may provide opportunities for improvement to the network.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	**Question 97:** 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?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	The principles established in this option would be a key element in achieving sustainable travel and transport infrastructure objectives, by seeking to ensure development that would harm these objectives would not be permitted. It would promote modal shift away from the private car, ensuring that infrastructure for sustainable modes is integral with development. As such its significant positive impacts will be on securing transport infrastructure and enabling travel by sustainable modes. There are also benefits for accessing services and facilities, and redressing inequalities. There is also potential to reduce the dominance of the private car on the streetscape, therefore contributing to spaces which work well and look good. It also refers to the mitigation of other impacts related to transport, which could support achievement of air quality and health objectives.
Representations Received	Support: 85, Object: 2, Comment: 25
Key Issues from Representations	**SUPPORT:** • Not enough provision of transport between villages. • Bus services are poor, expensive – people can't/won't use them. Promote school buses. • Developments should be expected to address the transport

issues they generate, including traffic congestion, and meet the demands sustainably.

- Developments should not be located in areas that increase travel demands.
- Accord higher priority to cycling, including priority over cars, especially at junctions. More routes needed, not just in/out Cambridge but between villages. Build more long distance commuter cycle routes, segregated from major roads. Consider links to existing cycle routes, improvement of routes, and the effect of increased traffic (motor or cycle) on existing cycle routes.
- All provisions for sustainable travel should link up with existing routes. Important to have a comprehensive sustainable travel network linked to surrounding employment and transport hubs.
- Discourage car use and greater emphasis on reducing need to travel, by car.
- Existing rights of way network should be protected and enhanced.
- Appeal to Government for funding to reduce congestion from through-traffic on A14.

OBJECTIONS:
- Support principles but must oblige developers to fund transport infrastructure and must pressure central government to support rural areas - funding for public transport.
- Sustainable transport just an empty phrase. Realistically, most people will drive for the foreseeable future.
- Must be rigorously applied for all new developments.

COMMENTS:
- Policy will need to be very clearly defined - "significant" and "appropriate" will be need to be formalized.
- Assessments of impact should be based on existing patterns of travel - take account of variety of factors such as journey time, cost, frequency and convenience rather than mere presence of a transport link.
- Broader issue of cross county boundary development needs to be recognised. Developers should mitigate the effects even when occurs in a different planning authority's area. Clear processes need to be developed to formalise this requirement.
- Routes need to be improved for any increase in use before the development inhabited. Sustainable travel unviable in rural areas.
- Cars will be "sustainable" in 10-20 years - largely ignored – will result in negative economic impact.
- Increases in traffic congestion could be problem if modelling is

	insufficient to provide appropriate capacity before building commences.
	• Loss of facilities in villages making residents dependant on transport.
	• Removing upper limit of size of development in settlements does not provide certainty and ability to plan for long term delivery of services and infrastructure - size should be determined locally having regard to implications on infrastructure provision, the environment and the wider area.
	• Specific proposals – Provision of Park and Ride south of Harston, River Cam towpath improvements, improve National Cycle Network route 11, encourage food shops around transport hubs, build rapid transit from Waterbeach to Cambourne via Cambridge, increase the Trumpington and Babraham Road Park and ride car parks, develop local train stations from villages into town and main station, consider a metro.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	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. The policy will also incorporate the need for development to mitigate its travel impacts, including cumulative impacts, and require larger developments with significant traffic impact to provide a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, with smaller developments providing a Transport Statement. The wording of the policy needs to be flexible enough to allow for the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy and/or use of Section 106 agreements to secure necessary transport infrastructure and address cross boundary issues.
	Widespread support for the policy approach, including from 15 Parish Councils, Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. Comments suggest links between villages are poor and the loss of facilities and services are making residents dependent on transport. Suggestions were made for improvements to bus and cycle infrastructure, including the need for better connectivity with the existing network to the main centres, and also a need to consider cross-boundary issues.
	The development strategy in the Local Plan should 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. The policy is flexible enough to allow a range

	of measures to be sought from developers to encourage sustainable travel, including infrastructure for walking, cycling and public transport, which should address comments received. The policy brings together and consolidates existing LDF policies TR/1 Planning for Sustainable Travel, TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impacts and TR/4 Non-motorised modes as they are closely interrelated. The policy also incorporates cumulative impacts and addresses cross boundary issues, in response to comments received.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy TI/2: Planning for Sustainable Travel

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 98	**Transport Assessments and Travel Plans**
Key evidence	• Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan • Cambridge Corridor Area Transport Plans
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Mitigating Travel Impact (TR/3)
Analysis	The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 30) states 'Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.' 'Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development…' (paragraph 31) 'All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment.' (paragraph 32) The current policy threshold for requiring a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan conforms with PPG13. The NPPF does not define 'significant amounts of movement'. South Cambs has high levels of through traffic and long distance commuting, both on the trunk road and the county's primary road network. High house prices, results in substantial amounts of travel from elsewhere in the county or beyond into Cambridge. Radial routes into the city are regularly congested, particularly during peak periods, and traffic queues often back up into South Cambs with resultant impacts on air quality, safety, noise etc. for

local communities living nearby. The level of growth planned for South Cambs and Cambridge will put further pressure on existing transport infrastructure and will require a proportionate investment to develop the transport network. There are capacity issues on some routes which could impact on the ability to accommodate further development without investment to resolve congestion issues.

Given the existing constraints on parts of the transport network even small levels of additional traffic may be considered to have a significant impact, therefore it may be appropriate to set a local threshold for when a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be required.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:
Given the existing constraints on parts of the transport network it is proposed to maintain the current policy threshold for the requirement of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. Smaller developments may still be required to submit them when there are particular transport issues.

(The level of detail required (i.e. Transport Assessment or Statement) will depend on the development proposal, location and existing conditions. Where appropriate, a Travel Plan will be required to demonstrate potential to achieve a sustainable modal split).

Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	**Question 98:** **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? **B:** Should an alternative threshold be used, if so what, and why?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	The assessment of travel impacts, and the longer term measures to support sustainable travel offered by Travel Plans, again have potential to contribute significantly to achievement of the transport objectives. Continued use of sustainable modes could also contribute to health objectives.
Representations Received	**Question 98A:** Support: 57, Object: 0, Comment: 4 **Question 98B:** Support: 2, Object: 4, Comment: 6
Key Issues from Representations	**SUPPORT:** • 15 Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council support current approach. • Impact of any development should be taken into account and meet the demands sustainably.

	- Developments should not be located in areas that increase travel demands. - Given the constraints on the network, even small developments may have significant impact – consider very localised impacts. - Assess impact on existing settlements and capacity of roads. - Essential that Transport Assessment is examined carefully to check realistic - critical factor in determining whether development is allowed. - Travel plans only mean something if there is money to make public transport work – need shuttle buses from villages to transport hubs (e.g. P&R). - Consider cumulative impacts of smaller developments and utilising area wide Travel Plans. Require monitoring and enforcement. **COMMENTS:** - Need to define 'particular transport implications'. - Cars are too numerous because there are not enough decent alternatives for people who live out of town - once you are out of Cambridge there are few options but to drive to work. - More speed limits and traffic calming in villages. 20 dwellings unlikely to have large impact (exception will require a TA). Requires too much information for small schemes, overburdening developer and Council dealing with application. More reasonable to rise thresholds. - All developments should include a Travel Plan – all cumulates – to particular bottlenecks at bad road junctions, or push a community over a threshold where a regular bus service is justified. - Suggest that thresholds for residential and commercial developments should double. - Should be additional requirements on larger developments, where the need for public transport improvements, etc. - should be integral to the justification for the concerned planning applications.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	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. There was widespread support for the current policy approach, which is working well. The policy will retain the current thresholds for requiring 'larger developments' and those with 'significant impacts' to provide

	Transport Assessments and Travel Plans, with smaller developments providing a less detailed Transport Statement, but take into consideration the cumulative impacts and allow greater flexibility to allow the provision of area-wide Travel Plans, in response to comments received.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy TI/2: Planning for Sustainable Travel

Policy TI/2: Planning for Sustainable Travel

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 45 Support: 21 (including 2 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 24 (including 6 from PC)
Main Issues	**Support** • **Cambridgeshire County Council** – Location of development important to ensure distance and need for travel is reduced and maximises opportunity to travel by sustainable modes. All sites in plan can achieve appropriate access from network, but need comprehensive Transport Assessment to fully assess. • **Fulbourn PC** - Support this policy to encourage and support cycling and use of public transport. • **Great Chesteford PC** – Strong support. Fits well with footpath / cycle path project to link villages. • **Natural England** – Support protection and enhancement of routes and linkages between villages, Northstowe, Cambridge, market towns and wider countryside. Pleased developers will be required to mitigate environmental impacts. • **Rampton PC** – Criterion 2b - important for small infill villages, to provide access without car. Need cycleway to Willingham. • Most effective way of achieving is by ensuring correct spatial strategy is chosen - focus on edge of Cambridge/close to jobs. • Naïve to assume edge of town is more sustainable than rural area if effective and reliable public transport can be provided. • Travel by car is becoming increasingly unsustainable and a blight. Roads too busy. Reality is people will continue to use their cars. • Against development that would lead to large increase in car use due to lack of public transport facilities within a village. • Support extending cycleways, particularly in villages along the Guided Busway to give good access for all. • Necessary to prevent transport infrastructure in the region becoming so overburdened it has negative economic impact. • List commendable but should not be used to bribe communities into accepting inappropriate levels of

	development.
	Object
	• **Barrington PC** – Does not address sustainable provision for the needs of Group Villages. Focus on walking, cycling and public transport at odds with reality.
	• **Bourn PC** – Support but lacks detail on timescales for attaining "sufficient integration". "Significant transport implications" does not consider distance from employment / service centres, as excludes cycling / walking as option.
	• **Cambridgeshire County Council** – Support but add reference to Transport Assessments being agreed with the local highway authority and encourage travel planning activities from smaller schemes.
	• **Dry Drayton PC** – Request network of off-road cycle paths along each road in / out of village.
	• **Haslingfield PC** — No direct / safe all weather cycling route to Cambridge. Uncertainty about public transport provision – essential for ageing population some of whom do not drive.
	• **Ickleton PC** – Policy will only succeed if new routes link with established settlements. Cycle path between Ickleton and Great Chesterford would link station, facilities and NCN11.
	• **Madingley PC** – Welcome development that reduces traffic and speeds, provides cycle / footpaths. Need new Park and Ride at Bar Hill, car park at Oakington Guided Bus stop, direct link to M11, A428 / A14 link, improved junction at Cambridge Road, Madingley and A1303.
	• **Royston Town Council** - Development at Cambourne already had significant effect on Royston. Bourn Airfield / Cambourne West and other developments should mitigate traffic impacts on Royston / pressure on station car park.
	• **Suffolk County Council** – Policy should secure appropriate improvement in accordance 'with the aims of relevant local transport plans or strategies'.
	• Add policy to include bus services / park and ride.
	• Radial roads clogged during rush hour and major developments will exacerbate.
	• Objective will not be achieved with the development strategy. Different travel patterns achieved in City, urban fringe and new settlements - evidence supports sites on urban fringe.
	• Fails to acknowledge parts of district not adequately served by public transport, yet these areas still have development needs.
	• Protect and enhance Rights of Way for all users (horse riders). Bridleways as default – good value for money.

Assessment	Policy combines policies from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, found sound through the examination. The Local Plan seeks to facilitate journeys by sustainable modes; locating development in sustainable locations where the need to travel can be minimised and opportunities to travel by sustainable modes maximised. Evidence shows more people are switching to sustainable modes, but the car will continue to have a role. Concentrating new development should also assist with addressing existing transport conditions, including congestion, by maximising developer funding available.
	Assessing transport impacts considers the number of trips generated per dwelling / land use and takes account of existing conditions locally. It does not consider where trip destinations are, which may influence choice of mode rather than number of trips.
	Cambridgeshire County Council seek the addition of a clarification that Transport Assessments should be agreed with the local highway authority and encourage travel planning activities from smaller schemes. A minor change is proposed as this reflects current practice.
	New development must integrate into existing networks to encourage non-car use. This can be delivered through planning conditions, S106 and/or CIL and timescales will vary, depending upon measures being implemented and by whom.
	Criterion 2 outlines measures how sustainable travel by walking, cycling and public transport can be achieved. It is not appropriate for the Local Plan to list specific schemes, such as new cycle routes, which would be a matter for the Local Transport Plan.
	Suffolk County Council suggest the policy should secure improvements in accordance with the transport plans / strategies. This has been addressed in the preceding section, where a minor change is proposed to paragraph 10.2.
	Minor changes are proposed in response to representations from Cambridgeshire County Council and to include reference to horse riders.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	**Minor change**
	Amend criterion 2b to read:
	'Provision of new cycle ~~and~~**,** walking **and horse riding** routes…'
	Amend criterion 2c to read:

	'Protection and improvement of existing cycle ~~and~~, walking **and horse riding** routes,…'
	Amend paragraph 10.18 to read:
	'…how they will be addressed, and how sustainable travel will be delivered in the long term. **These should be agreed with the highway authority.** For smaller developments with lower impacts, a simpler 'Transport Statement' is required**, which should demonstrate how it will encourage travel planning activities**...'

Policy TI/3: Parking Provision

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 99	How Car Parking is provided within Residential Developments
Key evidence	• South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document • Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Car and Cycle Parking Standards (TR/2)
Analysis	The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 39) states, 'If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account: • the accessibility of the development; • the type, mix and use of development; • the availability of and opportunities for public transport; • local car ownership levels; and • an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.' This represents a change of policy from previous government guidance (PPG13), which specifically required maximum parking standards to be set. Car ownership and car use should not be confused as being the same. Where good convenient pedestrian or cycle routes, or public transport, facilities are provided, people may choose to use those in preference to driving for regular journeys. However they will very likely own a car for convenient use for other journeys. Dwelling size and type are major factors in determining car ownership levels. Larger dwellings are more likely to be inhabited by more people of driving age and/or households with larger incomes, whilst smaller dwellings tend to be occupied by single-person households. In rural areas such as South Cambs car ownership levels are comparable for both rented and owner-occupied households, as there is a greater dependence on using private cars to access facilities. Overall the average number of vehicles per household identified in the 2001 census falls within the policy requirement; with average vehicle ownership levels per household in all the Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, except one, being 1.5 or less; and average vehicle ownership levels per household in Group Villages and Infill Villages being between 1.6 and 2.0, except for seventeen villages which have lower levels due generally to having good access to facilities.

The Council's current plan reflects previous national policy and includes a set of maximum standards, indicating the maximum number of spaces per house allowed in a development. The Council could continue this approach, which could help promote more sustainable travel choice, but it could also mean insufficient parking where ownership is high, particularly in more remote parts of the district. This can result in spill-over parking in inappropriate and sometimes dangerous locations, causing nuisance and/or hazard to other road users. In particular, comments made to the Council about new developments are often that the road widths are too narrow and yet on-street parking takes place anyway and causes problems for other road users.

The use of the car may be becoming both more restricted and expensive but ownership of cars is expected to grow until 2021. This would suggest levels of car parking need to rise to accommodate the extra vehicles. The 2001 census showed average vehicle ownership levels per household in South Cambridgeshire's larger villages as typically 1.5 or less; and smaller villages typically between 1.6 and 2.0. The 2011 census figures are not yet available. In response, the local plan could raise the current maximum standards in the new Local Plan to allow for current and future levels of demand.

A further option would be to include no standard. This would allow for a design-led approach whereby car parking provision could be tailored to reflect the specific development in terms of its location (whether there are local services available which may reduce the need to travel long distances by car), the density of development, the residential properties proposed (whether flats or large houses), together with consideration of any 'smart' measures being incorporated into the development, (such as car clubs), which may reduce the level of need for private car parking.

This third approach could potentially lead to better quality of built design, with potentially less land required for car parking if it is provided in innovative way, for example on appropriately designed streets and/or in small communal car parking areas which can be designed into the 'street scene'. It would allow greater flexibility for some developments, in appropriate locations, to reduce overall levels of car parking. Disadvantages are that it would provide less clarity to developers.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:
A range of alternative approaches has been identified:

i.   Current policy sets a maximum standard of an average of 1.5

	spaces per dwelling, up to a maximum of 2 spaces per 3 or more bedrooms in poorly accessible areas (garages count as parking spaces). Lower parking levels may be sought in areas with good accessibility to services, facilities, and public transport in appropriate circumstances. ii. An alternative option is that the level of provision could be raised slightly to take into account rising levels of car ownership. This could retain 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 less accessible areas. iii. A further option could be to remove all car parking standards and make developers determine a suitable level of car parking provision through a comprehensive design-led approach, reflecting the location, (whether there are local services available which may reduce the need to travel long distances by car), the density of development, the residential properties proposed (whether flats or large houses), together with consideration of any 'smart' measures being incorporated into the development, (such as car clubs), which may reduce the level of need for private car parking. The developer would need to demonstrate that they have provided enough car parking to ensure highway safety. Further guidance could be provided in the District Deign Guide SPD.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	**Question 99:** **A:** What approach should the Local Plan take towards residential car parking standards? (note – all options are subject to achieving appropriate highway safety) 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. 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. iii. Remove all car parking standards and adopt a design-led approach to car parking provision in new developments.

Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal (March 2014)
Annex A – Audit Trail

	B: Are there any alternative polices or approaches you think should be included?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	The impact on objectives such as achieving sustainable transport depends on whether parking standards actually curb car use or discourage car ownership, balanced with the negative impact on creating places which work well if there is inadequate provision. This uncertainty is reflected in the scoring. Options setting maximum standards have positive impact on land objective, as they reduce the land taken up potentially by parking. The option proposing higher levels would require additional land, but it would still be subject to a specific limit. A design led approach (option iii) would deliver less certainty, although it could actually use land more efficiently by adding flexibility to reflect site specific circumstances. Setting a slightly higher standard could have a positive impact on creating good spaces, as it could lead to better management of the car. The same is true of the design led approach. It would give less certainty given the greater flexibility, but it would allow parking to be tailored to the location and the opportunities of the site.
Representations Received	**Question 99Ai:** Support: 1, Object: 6, Comment: 1 **Question 99Aii:** Support: 16, Object: 1, Comment: 4 **Question 99Aiii:** Support: 19, Object: 2, Comment: 3 **Question 99B:** Support: 1, Object: 0, Comment: 16 **Other comments:** Support: 1, Object: 3, Comment: 10
Key Issues from Representations	**Question 99Ai** **SUPPORT:** • Maximum standards should not preclude design-led approach. • Most realistic option. • Enough if there is good public transport e.g. at Northstowe and Waterbeach and close to guided busway stops. **OBJECTIONS:** • Too restrictive. • Current policy having negative impacts, but no impact on car usage. **COMMENTS:** • Need flexible approach for villages depending on public

transport available but generally with more parking spaces as usually at least 2 people need a car.

Question 99Aii

SUPPORT:
- 11 Parish Councils support a higher maximum standard.
- Must be enough parking for residents and visitors where public transport is not adequate, to stop car unsightly parking. Unrealistic to expect rely on public transport, cycling or walking.
- Provision currently too low - results in dangerous parking putting pedestrians and other road users at risk.

OBJECTIONS:
- Too restrictive.

COMMENTS:
- Policy must be worked through together with design guidelines for room sizes, street widths and design etc.
- If inadequate off road parking is supplied, road width and design must take into consideration cars will be parked on streets (safety).
- Should be a desirable target standard rather than maximum because of failures to provide adequate and realistic levels of public transport that can attract users away from their cars and motorbikes.

Question 99Aiii

SUPPORT:
- 9 Parish Councils support design-led approach – could encourage innovation but warned developers could use it to reduce costs.
- Rural areas need cars and we should learn to live with the car.
- Areas of restricted parking become blighted by dangerously parked cars on streets.
- The other two options have caused conflict in the past with planners accused of a lack of realism.
- This would promote a detailed analysis of local requirements and future flexibility.
- Provision would need to reflect not only the demand at the time of development, but be sustainable longer-term.

OBJECTIONS:
- This would be a disaster.
- Would lead to additional burden for every scheme to justify

approach, uncertainty, and possibly reason for refusal.

COMMENTS:
- Guidance should be dependent on site characteristics and proximity to public transport nodes.

Question 99B

COMMENTS:
- Return to minimum standards – 2 Parish Councils support view, one suggests 2 spaces.
- Remove 'maximum' and include 'target' provision. Avoids being prescriptive - precludes innovative design / results in extensive negotiations. Can deal with site specific issues.
- Research shows car ownership is much reduced where car clubs are available.
- Consider impact of more older people driving and whilst not 'disabled' might have restricted mobility and consequently may require wider spaces.
- Design developments to facilitate easier short trips by walking or cycling than the car.
- Ensure that future housing is spaced correctly to allow enough parking.
- Provide parking within curtilege to avoid on-street parking, with associated safety issues.
- Needs to be considered with Issue 100.
- Forcing people to use public transport by limiting parking does not work.
- Include visitor parking.
- Quicker adoption of roads so inappropriate parking can be prevented and road safety improved. Provision should separate pedestrian and road traffic. Too many spaces in Cambourne are misused with pavements blocked and parking on junctions.

Other comments:
- How many cars does 1.5 spaces equate to?
- Control of car ownership by restricting parking can only be achieved by strict enforcement, which Police seem unwilling to do.
- Where parking is on premises, no more than 2 spaces per house. Communal parking bays for houses/flats should have allowance for visitors. Total will depend on size of the houses/flats.
- In rural areas the number of cars is normally the same as number of adults living in the house. Not going to change, even with good public transport.

	• Parking away from house may mean the owner is unable to charge an electric car – numbers likely to increase in 10-20 years. Needs to be addressed at planning stage. • Encourage developments close to guideway route with less parking than developments more than 1.5km from guideway stops.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	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, taking into consideration the site location, type and mix of uses, car ownership levels, availability of local services, facilities and public transport, and highway and user safety issues, as well as ensuring appropriate parking for people with impaired mobility. There was more support for increasing the maximum standards, to reflect the increasing levels of car ownership and the existing problems caused by insufficient car parking, or for adopting a design-led approach. It was also suggested that the standards could be used as a target rather than an absolute requirement. To reflect the comments received, the residential car parking standard has been raised to 2 spaces and the policy provides guidance whilst maximising flexibility through a design-led approach, allowing different approaches for different locations and types of development. 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.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy TI/3: Parking Provision

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 100	**Allocation of Car Parking within Residential Developments**
Key evidence	• South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document • Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Car and Cycle Parking Standards (TR/2)
Analysis	The CLG's publication Residential Car Parking Research (May 2007) highlights that allocating car parking spaces to specific properties reduces the efficiency of car parking provision as not all

	households own a car. Car parking spaces will be provided but not used, especially where this provision is on-plot, whilst some other households may have more cars than allocated spaces, requiring additional spaces to be provided to accommodate these vehicles. Maximum flexibility and therefore efficient use of car parking spaces is attained through providing unallocated parking spaces. To maximise the efficiency of car parking provision the allocation of more than half of parking spaces is discouraged. The developer should propose a design-led approach to the incorporation of car parking within the development, appropriate to the site location and the residential typologies proposed, that addresses the need for allocated and / or unallocated spaces for residents and visitor parking. Some scales and locations of development may enable provision of alternatives such as car clubs to be provided.
	Provision of unallocated parking also allows for provision of electric charging points for cars in locations accessible to the whole development and provision of car sharing schemes.
	Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:
	i. In order to maximise the efficiency of car parking provision across the whole development, it could require parking spaces to not be allocated to individual properties. This would reduce the overall levels of car parking needed to serve the development as a whole.
	ii. An alternative option would be to only allocate a proportion of car parking spaces needed to serve the whole development to individual properties, for example one space per dwelling. The design of the development could incorporate safe areas on-street or in designated areas to ensure additional cars can be parked without nuisance or hazard to other road users. This could ensure that on-street parking is properly designed into a development and help avoid the concerns often raised about new developments.
	iii. Alternately the Local Plan could not set a specific requirement, and the issue could be left to the design of individual developments to consider.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.
Final Issues and Options	**Question 100** **A:** What approach should the Local Plan take to the allocation of

Approaches	car parking spaces in residential developments? i. The Local Plan should maximise the efficiency of car parking provision by not allocating any residential car parking to individual properties. ii. The Local Plan should only allocate a proportion of the car parking spaces to individual properties. iii. The Local Plan should not address the allocation of parking spaces, and it should be left to the design of individual developments. **B:** Are there any alternative polices or approaches you think should be included?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	The non-allocation of parking spaces would support the land objective, as it would deliver the most efficient use of land. It could contribute to objectives regarding townscape and creating good spaces, as it could lead to environments which manage parking well, integrated with the design of the development, but this would depend on implementation. There is also uncertainty over the crime objective, as it could result in cars parked away from properties, but again this could be addressed by effective design.
Representations Received	**Question 100Ai:** Support: 1, Object: 6, Comment: 1 **Question 100Aii:** Support: 10, Object: 1, Comment: 2 **Question 100Aiii:** Support: 18, Object: 1, Comment: 1 **Question 100B:** Support: 3, Object: 0, Comment: 8 **Other comments:** Support: 0, Object: 1, Comment: 7
Key Issues from Representations	**Question 100Ai** **OBJECTIONS:** • Will not work in practice - people will park where convenient - people want to park in front of their houses. Garages and parking spaces separated from properties tend not to be well used and risk creating 'urban wastelands'. Will lead to displeasure with development designs. Only appropriate in denser developments. • 3 Parish Councils consider all parking should be provided on-plot not communal / on-street. • Develops potential for overspill or commuter parking and for introduction of parking fees such as "resident parking permits". • More dangerous having to walk any distance, with children and bags, particularly if you have to cross the road.

COMMENTS:
- Should be left to design of individual developments but with minimum standards.

Question 100Aii

SUPPORT:
- 5 Parish Councils support allocating a proportion - one suggests minimum of 2 spaces.
- Anything else will likely result in unwanted friction between neighbours as car ownership increases.
- Works in Switzerland - informal network ensuring allocated spaces are used, not necessarily by the residents of the dwelling owning the allocation.
- At least one space provided per dwelling. Many people would be loath to leave vehicles in communal parking bays, possibly out of sight.
- In rural communities, driveway parking should be allocated with a minimum allocation of 2 spaces per property.

COMMENTS:
- Locate so entire front garden does not become a car park. Prevent front gardens being turned into paved parking spaces, losing the potential for planting and increasing water run-off problems.

Question 100Aiii

SUPPORT:
- Cambridgeshire County Council and 10 Parish Councils support a design-led approach - allows different approaches for different target groups and for different locations.
- Developers and Planners need to agree a suitable provision for each development.
- At least one car space plus parking for visitors as minimum.
- Gives the flexibility for innovative design, ideas, and provision based on need, demand. Most likely to provide what is needed.
- Aim for higher on-site parking in more rural areas where car ownership is a necessity and land prices are less.
- Attention should be given to ensuring any on street parking/visitor spaces are well integrated.

OBJECTIONS:
- Developer will have no vested interest in serving needs of community as purely profit-motivated.

	Question 100B
	COMMENTS:
	• All residences should have garage space, or easy access to charging points.
	• Parking should be adequate for family vehicles, people who need extra space for mobility etc.
	Other comments
	• Road widths in new developments are too narrow and on-street parking takes place anyway, causes problems for other road users.
	• Provision of communal parking areas does not mean people will use them. If allocation left to developers, there would be minimum provision to maximise profit. Allocated spaces unused by one occupant may well be used by the next occupant.
	• What about underground parking allocation?
	• Avoid being overly prescriptive - preclude innovative design, impede new solutions and result in extensive negotiations. Need discretion and ability to deal with site specific circumstances.
	• Car ownership is increasing - should have appropriate parking. If unallocated, adequate on road parking should be provided with wide enough roads and good visibility to ensure safety.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	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.
	There was a mixed response, with more support for allocating a proportion of car parking spaces or leaving it to a design-led approach. Concerns were raised that roads need to be suitable to accommodate parked cars safely if there was not sufficient provision made on-plot. A comment was made that parking provision should enable the charging of electric plug-in vehicles.
	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, which would allow for charging of an electric vehicle, in response to comments received.
Policy included in the draft Local	Policy TI/3: Parking Provision

Plan?	

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 101	Residential Garages
Key evidence	• South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document • Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm
Existing policies	
Analysis	Current policy counts garages towards parking provision. However, where developers provide garages they are often of a size standard that relates to older cars of smaller size than their modern counterparts and residents find it difficult to garage their vehicles, resulting in garages being under used. Also residents frequently use garages as storage, due to the inadequate levels of storage provided within homes, which also displaces parking. For garages to count towards parking provision they should be of a minimum size to address the required purposes. **Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:** The Local Plan could specify minimum dimensions for residential garages that are able to accommodate modern cars, cycles and other storage needs before they can be counted towards car parking provision.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	**Question 101:** What approach should the Local Plan take to residential garages? i) Specify minimum size dimensions for garages to count towards parking standards, to ensure they are large enough to easily accommodate modern cars, cycles and other storage needs; or ii) Not address the issue of residential garage sizes.
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	There are clear benefits to ensuring garages can accommodate cars, for the efficient use of land, and for townscape and creating places, as it could reduce the need for cars to be parked elsewhere.
Representations Received	**Question 101i:** Support: 42, Object: 0, Comment: 2 **Question 101ii:** Support: 7, Object: 1, Comment: 0 **Other comments:** Support: 0, Object: 1, Comment: 3
Key Issues from Representations	**Question 101i**

	SUPPORT: • Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and 21 Parish Councils support approach. • Do not allow developers to build any more estates where people are forced to park on narrow roads as garages are not big enough. • Garages should be large enough for family vehicles and for the driver to get in/out, whatever their level of mobility/size. • In conjunction with issues 99 &100 ensuring adequate and safe parking is allocated for each dwelling. • If cycle storage is shared with car parking the garage should be enlarged to suit both. • Consideration should be given to double garages. Learn from difficulties in provision of car parking in urban extensions. • Without, there is a risk that developers will cut the provision of this most useful space. **OBJECTIONS:** • Do not specify bigger garages for ever larger cars - current fad for 4x4s will not last as fuel prices rise and more people take CO_2 emission seriously. **COMMENTS:** • Most new garages are so small that although a car can be driven into one, it is impossible to open the door and get out! **Question 101ii** **SUPPORT:** • 2 Parish Councils support approach. • Overkill for such detail. • Garage size should be demand driven and not mandated - could increase cost of already expensive housing stock without guarantees this space will actually be used for car parking. **Other comments** • Avoid being overly prescriptive - preclude innovative design, impede new solutions and result in extensive negotiations. Need discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances. • Policy to restrict conversion of domestic garages to additional rooms should be considered. • Provision of other storage options (e.g. sheds) could release garages for car use, at lower cost.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	Include within the parking provision policy the specification that only garages over the minimum size can count towards car parking provision - the minimum size should be 3.3m x 6m.

	Where garages are also to provide for secure storage of cycles (to meet cycle parking standards), the minimum size should be increased by 1m at the end and/or 650-750mm at the side.
	There is considerable support for only counting garages towards car parking provision where they meet a minimum size threshold, with comments that modern garages are not fit for purpose with larger modern cars and the need for storage, including for cycles. This has created parking problems in some areas where garages have been counted but not used.
	The Building Regulations do not specify minimum sizes, there are no British Standards and there is no legal minimum. However, the District Design Guide SPD recommends internal dimensions of 3.3m x 6m, and could include additional flexibility of 1m at the end and/or 650-750mm at the side to allow for cycle storage. Concern was also raised that garages have been converted resulting in inappropriate parking.
	The parking provision policy provides flexibility to developers to provide appropriate car and cycle parking in developments, which can include cycle parking in garages or other secure locations such as a shed. Garages need not count towards car parking provision, but where they are counted the policy ensures they are a suitable size to be fit for purpose, particularly if they are being used for cycle parking as well. In addition, planning conditions may be required to prevent the conversion of the garage where it provides the only parking space within the curtilage, in response to a concern raised.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy TI/3: Parking Provision

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 102	**Car Parking Standards for Other Types of Developments**
Key evidence	• South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document • Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Car and Cycle Parking Standards (TR/2)
Analysis	The Council's existing plan includes maximum parking standards for non-residential development, providing a range of different thresholds for different uses including employment, retail and community uses. Whilst these are maximum standards, the

	Council may still require a certain level of parking from individual developments on a case by case basis, in order to secure highway safety.

Current parking standards for non-residential uses seek to maximize opportunities to share car parking where uses permit; for example where uses require parking at different times of day.

The provision of disabled car parking bays will need to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act and Part M of the Building Regulations.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:
The Council's current plan sets maximum parking standards for a range of non-residential uses. It also encourages shared use of car parking, particularly in mixed-use developments where there is a mixture of day time and night time uses. These could be carried forward into the new Local Plan. |
| **Which objectives does this issue or policy address?** | Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change. |
| **Final Issues and Options Approaches** | **Question 102:**
Should the Local Plan carry forward the maximum parking standards for non-residential development included in its existing plan? |
| **Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary** | Controlling parking at the destination could encourage use of sustainable modes. It also supports efficient use of land, and the creation of environments less dominated by the car. |
| **Representations Received** | Support: 19, Object: 4, Comment: 13 |
| **Key Issues from Representations** | **SUPPORT:**
• 11 Parish Councils support.
• Sharing parking areas should be encouraged, especially between adjacent retailers. Present generous provision arises from reluctance of people to walk more than a short distance to cars. What about pick up points?

OBJECTIONS:
• Avoid being overly prescriptive - preclude innovative design, impede new solutions and result in extensive negotiations. Need element of discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances.
• Preserve scarce land resources, supermarkets should not be allowed vast surface car parks when restricted for other users. Prefer underground or multi-storey car parks for large retail / commercial developments. |

	• Should be specific to South Cambridgeshire – bring forward new standards that take local circumstances into account.
	• Risks getting out of date quite quickly not to mention appearing to sail against the stream.
	COMMENTS:
	• Should ensure provision is adequate and does not result in overflow parking on neighbouring roads.
	• Use of maximum car parking spaces as a means of restricting car use needs to be applied with care especially as bus subsidies are being removed.
	• Major re-think is necessary. E.g. parking at SCDC very quickly became full until redundancies took place. Not an ideal way to provide more parking.
	• Should reflect the location of the development and be sufficient to avoid problems of on-street parking.
	• Important tool to 'encourage' sustainable transport. Apply area-wide Travel Plans, including car park management to allow equity. Effective Travel Plan will ensure 'carrots' of incentives and facilities encourage as much sustainable travel as possible as well as the 'stick' of reduced car parking.
	• If carry forward current maximum car parking standards, policy should allow for the application of issues in NPPF (para 39).
Preferred Approach and Reasons	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, taking into consideration the site location, type and mix of uses, availability of public transport, and highway and user safety issues, as well as ensuring appropriate parking for people with impaired mobility. There was broad support for the current approach, although comments were made about avoiding wasteful expanses of parking but also ensuring sufficient provision to avoid spill-over into adjoining streets. Non-residential car parking is also an important 'tool' in encouraging sustainable travel as part of the Travel Plan. A comment was made about charging of electric cars in respect of the residential parking standards, but is also relevant for other uses if they are to be a practical option in the future. 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. The parking provision policy includes a requirement that at least one residential car parking space is

	allocated to the property and provided on-plot to enable the home owner to charge an electric plug-in vehicle. Other developments will be required to address the issue of electric charging points through the Travel Plan.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy TI/3: Parking Provision

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 103	**Cycle Parking Standards**
Key evidence	• South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Car and Cycle Parking Standards (TR/2)
Analysis	The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 30) states 'Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.'

Nearly all of South Cambs is within 10km of Cambridge or a market town, which is a reasonable cycling distance.

The current district-wide approach to cycle parking is a minimum of 1 secure cycle space per dwelling, although higher standards apply to developments on the edge of Cambridge and Northstowe. Given the emphasis on encouraging more sustainable travel this is very low and the plan could include higher standards.

One approach would be to require one space per bedroom, similar to the Cambridge City standards.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:

Retain existing minimum cycle parking standards.

Retain minimum cycle parking standards but set new higher levels of provision.

Do not set any cycle parking standards and use a design-led approach where developers justify their parking provision through the Transport Assessment / Transport Statement / Travel Plan. |
| **Which objectives does this issue or policy address?** | Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change. |

	Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	**Question 103:** **A:** What approach should the Local Plan take towards cycle parking standards? i. Retain the current minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development. ii. Continue to set minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development, but develop new higher levels of provision. iii. Remove cycle parking standards, but include a policy requiring cycle parking provision, adopting a design-led approach **B:** Are there any alternative polices or approaches you think should be included?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Requiring cycle parking clearly contributes to sustainable transport, and objectives for improving health. The design led approach (option Aiii) introduces a greater level of uncertainty, but provides the opportunity to tailor the provision to the circumstances and opportunities of the individual development. It is not clear whether the higher standards (option Aii) would significantly improve achievement of the objectives, but they would reflect the more significant opportunities available where shorter travelling distances are required.
Representations Received	**Question 103Ai:** Support: 3, Object: 0, Comment: 2 **Question 103Aii:** Support: 22, Object: 1, Comment: 3 **Question 103Aiii:** Support: 11, Object: 2, Comment: 0 **Question 103B:** Support: 0, Object: 0, Comment: 3
Key Issues from Representations	**Question 103Ai** **COMMENT:** • Support principle but level of provision should be proportionate. One space per bedroom is too much and leads to over provision. **Question 103Aii** **SUPPORT:** • 9 Parish Councils and Cambridge City Council support. • Including standards should not preclude design-led approach. • High quality provision of appropriate levels is important in ensuring success of new developments. Be proactive in seeking new provision on both new developments and throughout the District.

- Essential given importance of cycling to Cambridge area.
- Standards need to be much higher to reflect probable number of occupants of the dwelling (taking account of double rooms) and the fact many regular commuters have more than one cycle. Important all members of family can own and securely store cycles. Design of parking is also important.
- Adopt all measures that might lead to increase in cycle ownership and security if number of miles cycled is to increase.
- Support combination of design-led and minimum standards. Use of 'visitor parking' sheffield stands for secure locking, as part of residential/street infrastructure encourages local cycle trips.
- Standard should be 1 space per bedroom, undercover and lockable – e.g. garage / shed.
- More needed, especially with Olympic legacy. Insist on minimum standards of style, type, covered and location. Shower/locker and drying room provision to encourage cycling to work. Travel plans need to be implemented, monitored and enforced to ensure this provision is taken up.

OBJECTIONS:
- Support principle but the level of provision should be proportionate. One space per bedroom is far too much and leads to over provision.

Question 103Aiii

SUPPORT:
- 6 Parish Councils support.
- Encourages planners to follow current trends.

OBJECTIONS:
- Minimum levels should continue to be applied.

COMMENTS:
- Genome Campus has exemplar campus-wide Travel Plan actively promoting cycling. Not always appropriate for individual developments to provide separate spaces (requested relaxation of standards). Approach should retain commitment to provision, but design-led approach to location and numbers more appropriate.

Question 103B

SUPPORT:
- Secure cycle space should also be considered at bus stops, given some stops are some distance from housing.
- Cycle parking standards should be reviewed and updated to

	reflect local circumstances. • Target should be given with allowance for under and over provision based on individual circumstances. Would allow variation in provision, but provides more clarity for developers. **Other comments** • Promoting cycling is commendable - note that cycling can be seasonal and many cyclists own and use cars - cannot be relied upon for modal shift. • Avoid being overly prescriptive - preclude innovative design, impede new solutions and result in extensive negotiations. Need element of discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances. • It is astonishing that current standards are for 1.5 cars per dwelling but only 1 bike! • It is not clear why this is necessary.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	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, taking into consideration the site location, type and mix of uses, availability of public transport, and highway and user safety issues. Clear support for including higher cycle parking standards for residential developments, including in conjunction with a design-led approach. 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. For example within residential developments cycle parking may be provided within garages and/or alternative secure facilities, taking into consideration the type and location of development. However, where garages are counted towards car parking provision (see Issue 101) and storage of cycles, the minimum size should be increased by 1m at the end and/or 650-750mm at the side.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy TI/3: Parking Provision
Policy TI/3: Parking Provision (paragraphs 10.23-10.25 and Figure 12)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 15 Support: 6 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 9 (including 3 from PC)

Main Issues	**Support**
	• **Bourn PC** – Support - defines standards for car parking and garage sizes. Support promotion of cycle parking to encourage more people to cycle. Current developments have insufficient car and cycle parking spaces leading to inappropriate parking.
	• **Oakington & Westwick PC** – support criterion 4 – specify minimum size dimensions for garages so large enough for modern cars, cycles and other storage needs.
	• For the share of cycling to grow, adequate facilities have to be provided over and above current level of demand. The number of spaces defined in this policy will help achieve this.
	Object
	• **Bourn PC** – Footnote 2 – specify minimum height for MPVs or 4 wheel drive vehicles? Figure 12 – unclear as to allocation of parking for multiple residential properties such as flats.
	• **Caldecote & Cambourne PCs** – Change 'minimum' to 'indicative' to ensure flexibility in accordance with Travel Plan. Review after 1 year. Undue costs on community buildings.
	• **Homes and Communities Agency** – Object to 1 cycle space per bedroom - excessive. Seek flexibility, including communal parking. Is the standard for A2 uses an error ($2m^2$)?
	• **Oakington & Westwick PC** – remove all car parking standards and adopt design-led approach.
	• Wording of policy contradicts supporting text - policy advises standards should be met but text advises indicative standards.
Assessment	New policy providing much more flexibility through a design-led approach, in keeping with the National Planning Policy Framework.
	Cycle Parking
	Many households have numerous occupants and may own several cycles, and some people own more than one cycle, for on- and/or off-road use. As such one space per bedroom is not excessive, particularly in an area where cycling levels are higher than the national average and rising. There is sufficient flexibility for how to accommodate cycles within developments, e.g. within garages that meet the minimum size, therefore the standard is not onerous.
	The minimum garage size ensures sufficient floor space for modern cars and storage, including for cycles. The average height of garage doors (7') is capable of accommodating most modern cars, including sport utility vehicles (just over 6').
	Car Parking
	Supporting text makes clear that the provision, design and allocation of car parking should be tailored to each development. It

	may not be appropriate to allocate car parking to individual flats; as within accessible locations, close to services and facilities, flats may not need to provide 1 space per dwelling, and/or parking may be provided in a shared-use car park to serve a mix of uses at different times of day and night.

Policy TI/3 requires car and cycle parking to be provided in accordance with standards in Figure 12. Policy criteria and supporting text explain a design-led approach should be applied using the indicative car parking standards on case-by-case basis. Cycle parking standards are minimum and development is required to meet these to ensure adequate provision to facilitate cycling and help address aspirations of transport plans / strategies.

Minor change proposed to car parking standards to correct a typo. |
| **Approach in Submission Local Plan** | **Minor change**

Amend the indicative car parking standard for A2 Uses to read: '1 space per 2**5**m^2' |

Policy TI/4: Rail Freight and Interchanges

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 104	Rail Freight Interchanges
Key evidence	Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan
Existing policies	• Development Control Policies DPD: Rail Freight Interchanges (TR/5) • Site Specific Policies DPD: Rail Freight (SP/18)
Analysis	The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 31) states 'Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges…' 'Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.' (paragraph 34) Cambridgeshire's roads have higher than the national average heavy commercial vehicle traffic and the use of inappropriate routes can have considerable impacts on villages. Freight traffic is predicted to quadruple by 2030. It is important freight generating uses are located in suitable locations and freight operators are using the most appropriate routes for their journeys, both of which should minimise environmental impacts on local communities. In addition, removing freight from roads onto rail will improve road traffic congestion and environmental impacts. Given the importance of supporting the economic prosperity of the Cambridge area and the forecast growth in freight traffic is untenable the Local Plan will need to facilitate and encourage the sustainable movement of freight, including a shift to rail wherever possible. Current policy permits the development of rail freight interchanges and safeguards existing sites. **Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:** Government guidance is to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges, and current policies safeguard land to facilitate this approach.

Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	**Question 104:** Should the Local Plan continue to protect rail freight interchange sites? Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Retains infrastructure with potential to get freight off the roads, which could benefit a number of objectives as a result of reduced road traffic, although no specific development is proposed.
Representations Received	Support: 31, Object: 0, Comment: 6
Key Issues from Representations	**SUPPORT:** • 12 Parish Councils support. • Freight should be on railways. Anything that helps modal shift and helps to keeps heavy lorries off the roads should be promoted, to improve safety and cut emissions. • Only include those sites where it can be demonstrated that there will be no adverse effects on the natural environment. • Suffolk County Council welcome further co-operation to ensure this provision is coordinated across Cambridge sub-region and beyond to reflect the national significance of freight distribution and the role of the Port of Felixstowe. **COMMENTS:** • Are there any rail freight interchange sites in the district? I cannot see they can contribute to reducing the amount of freight movement on the district's roads, given the pattern of development. • Efforts should be made to encourage transit freight to use rail and not cause congestion on road infrastructure. • Work with others to encourage freight transfer from road to rail. • A freight equivalent of "park and ride" should be considered.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	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. Clear support for continuing to protect rail freight interchange sites to encourage 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. Cambridgeshire's roads have higher than the national average

	heavy commercial vehicle traffic and freight traffic is predicted to quadruple by 2030. Use of inappropriate routes can have considerable impacts on villages. Given the importance of supporting the economic prosperity of the Cambridge area and that the forecast growth in freight traffic is untenable, the Local Plan will need to facilitate and encourage the sustainable movement of freight, including a shift to rail wherever possible. Government guidance is to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges, and the policy safeguards land to facilitate this approach.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy TI/4: Rail Freight and Interchanges

Policy TI/4: Rail Freight and Interchanges	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Support: 1 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 1
Main Issues	**Support** • **Bourn PC** – Strongly in favour of shifting more freight from road to rail given the strains on local road infrastructure. **Object** • Support proposals concerning rail freight and protection of sidings. Should require construction items to come by rail to Chesterton sidings for A14 / construction of new settlements.
Assessment	Policy combines two policies carried forward from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD and Site Specific Policies DPD, found sound through the examination. Policy CC/6 addresses construction methods, and requires a Construction Environmental Management Plan, or similar, to set out the management measures builders will adopt, which may include on-site recycling of materials. It will be for developers to demonstrate they have complied with Policy CC/6 and it is not appropriate to require construction materials be brought in by rail, which may not always be the most sustainable option.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	**No change**

Policy TI/5: Aviation-Related Development Proposals

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 105	Airfields and public safety zones
Key evidence	South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Aviation Related Development Proposals (TR/6)
Analysis	The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 33) states 'When planning for ports, airports and airfields that are not subject to a separate national policy statement, plans should take account of their growth and role in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. Plans should take account of this Framework as well as the principles set out in the relevant national policy statements and the Government Framework for UK Aviation.' South Cambs has a long association with flying and there are a number of established 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. 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. **Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:** There are a number of established aerodromes and smaller airfields in the district. The current policy provides a number of criteria for assessing new airfields or flying sites, to ensure all the impacts are fully considered and, where necessary, appropriate conditions are applied, to ensure they remain compatible with surrounding land uses.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy. Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.
Final Issues and	**Question 105:**

Options Approaches	**A:** Should the Local Plan continue to include a criteria-based policy for assessing and mitigating the impact of aviation related development proposals? **B:** Are there any alternative polices or approaches do you think should be included?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Aim of the option is to address noise and environmental issues, and therefore impacts on health.
Representations Received	Support: 25, Object: 0, Comment: 12
Key Issues from Representations	**SUPPORT:** • 11 Parish Councils support. • Light aircraft and helicopter flying should as far as possible be restricted. Noise nuisance to large numbers of people near the flight path far outweighs the benefit to the fliers. • Contribution of aviation operations to the prosperity of Cambridge area should be accepted and not obstructed. • Welcome a policy to ensure aviation development at Cambridge Airport is only permitted where it will not have a significant adverse effect on natural environment. **COMMENTS:** • Criteria for new airfields should be much stricter - consider not just current land use but also current sky use. Already lots of aviation activity. • Oppose any expansion in use of Cambridge airport. Been no consultation with local communities re recent new routes. Lots of affected houses around the airport. • Government advice in Circulars 1/2003 and 1/2010 offer clear and relevant advice dealing with public safety and safeguarding flying operations of airports. Policy should meet those requirements.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	Include an aviation related development 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. Clear support for a policy for assessing and mitigating the impacts of aviation related development proposals, with concern expressed about noise impacts and suggestion that the criteria should be stricter. There are a number of established 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. The current LDF policy approach to aviation-related development is 'sound' and consistent with the NPPF. This policy is rolled forward into the new Local Plan with minor amendments to update it.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy TI/5: Aviation-Related Development Proposals

Policy TI/5: Aviation-Related Development Proposals	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 11 Support: 3 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 8 (including 2 from PC)
Main Issues	**Support** • **Fulbourn PC** – Being regularly over-flown by aircraft from Cambridge Airport support this policy to protect amenities of local residents. • **Natural England** – Welcome requirement to take into account effects on nature conservation and landscape. • Cambridge Airport not suitable for further expansion - close proximity to city. Increase in flights will create major disturbance - night flying should not be permitted. **Object** • **Caldecote & Cambourne PC** – Preserve Bourn as a flying facility for commuting / recreation. Close to employment. Would decrease need for expanding other airfields. • **IWM Duxford** – Support criteria-based policy and tests include economic advantages / recreation opportunities. Criteria could impact on viability of business - historic aircraft (noise). Clarify that there are a variety of different airfields in South Cambs. • **Marshall of Cambridge** – Cambridge Airport makes positive contribution to economic well-being of area. DfT emphasises need to make best use of existing runways. Positively worded policy would accord with NPPF. • Cambridge Airport - significant impacts warrant separate policy • Lack of formal procedures to ensure development / change of activity complies with legislation - most development under permitted development rights. Not enforced.

Assessment	The policy has been carried forward from the adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The proposal to redevelop Bourn Airfield as a new village is addressed in the Strategy Chapter - loss of the airfield was taken into consideration in the site selection process. Although Cambridge Airport is larger and more frequently used than other airfields, the impacts should be considered and addressed in the same way. The policy is flexible enough to consider the merits as well as environmental and amenity impacts. Criterion 3 considers different types of activities and aircraft that may be used at different airfields and references historic aircraft. Minor change is proposed in response to a representation, acknowledging the different flying activities at IWM Duxford.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	**Minor change** Amend the first sentence of paragraph 10.29 to read: '…aerodromes and smaller airfields in the district**, including IWM Duxford with its large collection of flying historic aircraft**.'

Policy TI/6: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 106	Cambridge Airport – Aviation Development
Key evidence	
Existing policies	
Analysis	Whilst Cambridge Airport remains in operation, consideration needs to be given to airport activity and the approach that would apply to any future aviation development proposals coming forward at Cambridge Airport in order to ensure that any development would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity. Whilst airports have permitted development rights which mean that some types of development in connection with the provision of services and facilities do not need planning permission, other proposals such as the construction or extension of a runway, or new passenger terminal above 500 square metres or increasing the size of the existing building by 15% or more would need planning permission and a policy to deal with any such proposals would be appropriate reasonable option for consultation. **Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:** This option is to 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. Whilst this approach will only apply where certain types of airport development need planning permission, it would allow for due consideration of the impact of any proposals on the surrounding environment and residential amenity.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	**Issue 106:** **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? **B:** Are there any alternative polices or approaches do you think should be included?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Primary goals of a policy would be to protect amenity and health, it would therefore have a positive benefit compared with having no policy.
Representations Received	Support: 25, Object: 5, Comment: 9

Key Issues from Representations	**SUPPORT:** • 9 Parish Councils support. • Required to maintain the character and limit noise pollution. • Importance in underpinning the economic vitality of South Cambs and Cambridge City should also be a consideration. • Links strongly to major site selection criteria. • Cambridge City Council – Both Councils are consulting on options and will continue to work together to develop appropriate policies. • Being within the flying zone, Fulbourn is over flown regularly and suffers noise pollution from ground engine running. Wish policy to protect character and amenity of village. • Everything should be done to mitigate noise nuisance and potential danger from light aircraft and helicopters. For large aircraft the costs and benefits are completely different and such flights are unproblematic. **OBJECTIONS:** • Marshalls of Cambridge - A policy supportive of employment and aviation will help enhance the economic growth of Cambridge area. • Commercial and employment potential of Cambridge Airport ought not to be jeopardised. • Airport should be developed for housing. • Too restrictive - any adverse effect on environment and residential amenity should be balanced against economic and wider benefits. **COMMENTS:** • I suppose it is not within the council's powers to limit further aviation development to encourage Marshalls to re-locate? • Surely further development would impact on the environment and local amenity? But it does seem sensible to keep aviation activity on a site that is regulated. • Aviation development at the airport should not be opposed purely on environmental and amenity grounds. • Marshalls is important business in Cambridge and one of largest employers. Essential to be supported. While environmental and residential concerns must be taken into account, and safety paramount, further development to support business should be sympathetically considered. • Government advice in Circulars 1/2003 and 1/2010 offer clear and relevant advice dealing with public safety and safeguarding flying operations of airports. Policy should meet those requirements.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	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.

| | The inclusion of a criteria-based Aviation Related Development policy in the Local Plan will provide a sufficiently robust framework for considering any other issues around future development at Cambridge Airport.

Clear support for a policy to protect residential amenity, but a balance needs to be struck so the commercial and economic potential of the site would not be jeopardised.

Issue 105 considers the inclusion of an Aviation Related Development policy, applicable to all airfields and sites. There are no site specific issues relating to the operation and use of Cambridge Airport that would not be covered by the Aviation Related Development policy and other policies in the Local Plan.

Government policy identifies a Public Safety Zone at Cambridge Airport, which should be identified and safeguarded in the Local Plan. Whilst the airport is operational development will be restricted within the Public Safety Zone in order to minimise the number of people at risk of death or injury in the event of an aircraft crash on take-off or landing, to accord with national policy. |
|---|---|
| **Policy included in the draft Local Plan?** | Policy TI/6: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone |

Policy TI/6: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 3 Support: 1 Object: 2
Main Issues	**Support** • **Marshall of Cambridge** – Support policy which is firmly based on advice by central government to seek to minimise risk. **Object** • **Defence Infrastructure Organisation** – Statutory safeguarding / consultation zones around MOD aerodromes to ensure structures do not obstruct air traffic movements, compromise operation of air navigational transmitter, birdstrike. • **IWM Duxford** – Support but the Plan should include reference to the IWM Duxford Aerodrome Safeguarding Map.
Assessment	The policy has been carried forward from the Adopted Site Specific Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. Airport Safeguarding is the process established by the Department for Transport to ensure that all appropriate measures are taken to

	secure the safety of aircraft when taking off, landing or flying within the vicinity of an airport. To ensure that an airport's operation is not restrained by development in the vicinity of the airport, the airport operator is responsible for producing a safeguarding map and providing this to all Local Planning Authorities whose boundaries fall within a 15km radius of the airport. The Local Planning Authority will use this safeguarding map to determine the implications of development for the airport. It is a procedural issue that is already dealt with through the planning application process, however it would be helpful to include reference to it in the Local Plan to make potential applicants aware.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	**Minor change** Add a new section after paragraph 10.33: '**Air Safeguarding Zones** **10.34 Applications for development within Cambridge Airport's Air Safeguarding Zones (shown in Figure 12a) will be the subject of consultation with the operator of the airport and the Ministry of Defence. Restrictions in height, or changes to the detailed design of development may be necessary to mitigate the risk of aircraft accident and maintain the operational integrity of the airport.** **10.35 The purpose of airport safeguarding is to take the measures necessary to ensure the safety of aircraft, their passengers and crew while taking off or landing or while flying in the vicinity of Cambridge Airport. This is achieved by assessing proposed development so as to:** • **protect the air through which aircraft fly;** • **protect the integrity of radar and other electronic aids to air navigation;** • **protect visual aids, such as approach and runway lighting, by preventing them from being obscured, or preventing the installation of other lights; and** • **avoid any increase in the risk to aircraft of a birdstrike.** **10.36 A similar Aerodrome Safeguarding Zone applies to the Imperial War Museum Duxford (shown in Figure 12b). Applications for development within Duxford's Air Safeguarding Zones will be the subject of consultation with the aerodrome operator.'** **Maps will be included in the schedule of Minor Changes**

Policy TI/7: Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope

Issues and Options 2012 Chapter 13 – Lords Bridge Radio Telescope	Lords Bridge Radio Telescope
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Development Control Policies DPD: Policy SF/8 Lords Bridge Radio Telescope
Analysis	The international importance of the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge must be safeguarded. The Observatory contains unique radio and optical telescopes operated by the Universities of Cambridge and Manchester / Jodrell Bank. The telescopes measure signals that are very weak, and hence highly susceptible to many forms of interference, specifically electrical interference, light pollution and mechanical vibration from domestic, industrial plant and other sources such as vehicles and aircraft. Arrangements are made to consult the University of Cambridge about the technical consequences for the Observatory of proposed development. Harm caused to the Observatory will be overcome with the use of conditions or planning obligations to regulate the installation and use of equipment likely to interfere with the operation of the Observatory. **Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:** None. The policy should be carried forward into the new Local Plan. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy. Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	Carry forward the existing policy into the new Local Plan. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy TI/7: Lords Bridge Radio Telescope

Policy TI/7: Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Support: 1 Object: 1
Main Issues	**Support** • **Chanceller, Masters and Scholars of Univ. of Cambridge** – Lord's Bridge is internationally important, and the policy to protect its operational viability is supported. **Object** • Inclusion in this chapter inappropriate as radio telescope is not public infrastructure. Suggest it is included in chapter 8.
Assessment	The telescope is a piece of infrastructure and therefore most relevantly sits in Chapter 10.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	**No change**

Policy TI/8: Infrastructure and New Developments

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 107	Provision of Infrastructure and Services
Key evidence	• Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan • Infrastructure Delivery Study
Existing policies	• Development Control Policies DPD: Infrastructure and New Developments (DP/4) • Cambridge East Area Action Plan: Infrastructure Provision (CE/33).
Analysis	The National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to consider a wide variety of infrastructure needs, including transport. Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities (Paragraph 31). Local planning authorities should work with other authorities and providers to: • assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and • take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas. (paragraph 162) Current policy requires suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms, including a requirement for future maintenance and upkeep of facilities. This is related to the nature and scale of the development and its potential impact. The Council has commissioned an infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS), in partnership with Cambridge City Council to explore infrastructure needs and costs, when and where infrastructure will need to be provided, the scale of funding needed to achieve this, and potential sources of funding. It will also identify infrastructure critical to the delivery of the Local Plan. Infrastructure provision will be funded through a number of sources. Mainstream funding, such as the County Council's capital programmes, service providers' investment programmes, and Government grant, together with developer funding through

	planning obligations (section 106 agreements) and the Community Infrastructure Levy.
	Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan needs to include a policy regarding infrastructure provision, to require that development has made appropriate arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The nature, scale and phasing of any infrastructure or funding sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact. Contributions could also be used to secure future upkeep or maintenance where this is deemed appropriate. This will be by means of either planning obligations and/or a future CIL.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change. Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	**Question 107:** **A:** Should the Local Plan include a policy to require development to provide appropriate infrastructure? **B:** Are there any alternative polices or approaches do you think should be included?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	A policy would seek to mitigate the impact of development by ensuring appropriate investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure could address a wide variety of issues, potentially most of the issues addressed by the sustainability objectives.
Representations Received	Support: 77, Object: 0, Comment: 18
Key Issues from Representations	**SUPPORT:** • Cambridge City Council - assess viability - range of requirements and infrastructure plans likely to impact on the cost of development. Collaboration and consistency of approach important, particular with cross-boundary delivery. • Cambridgeshire County Council - important to ensure development provides appropriate infrastructure. • New development is key to delivery of new and improved infrastructure but should not burden villages – ensure adequate provision for transport, including effective and integrated public transport, effective road network (including M11, A14, A428, A1307), cycleways, footpaths, green infrastructure, traffic calming and other safety measures, P&R, waste, health, high

speed broadband (min 20Mbps), mitigate impact on countryside / villages.
- Timely and sustained (i.e. years) provision is important – in place before development. No more major development until delivered infrastructure for currently planned development.
- Section 106 agreements provided useful facilities in past. Whatever form this obligation takes in future, e.g. CIL, principle is very sound.
- Economy impacted by limitations of A14 and A428.
- Parish Councils should be consulted more closely - ensure service providers demonstrate sufficient capacity, verified by parish councils.
- Vital appropriate infrastructure provided to support development.
- Nature, scale and phasing of infrastructure / funding should be related to form of development and potential impact - secure future upkeep or maintenance.

COMMENTS:
- Greater Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Partnership - provide realistic, robust and deliverable strategy, identify key infrastructure constraints and highlight how constraints will be overcome - use as a lobbying tool to secure funding from Government.
- Middle Level Commissioners – Contributions and attenuation features required for drainage / flood prevention. Problems arise on piecemeal developments / with several developers – need a masterplan to consider what required.
- Suffolk County Council - Some pupils likely to attend schools in Suffolk - include consideration of demand for school places upon Suffolk schools - contributions may be required.
- Additional residential allocations should be made in Longstanton to deliver new infrastructure and support the existing facilities.
- No reference to key support infrastructure. Consider modern building techniques (to reach economic and sustainability targets).
- Infrastructure in Caldecote (electricity / internet / water) already poor - do not need more development. Need better transport, waste management at limit.
- Central Government should properly recognise the contribution Cambridge and Cambridgeshire make towards the national economy and provide proper funding to meet the ever increasing demands for infrastructure and public services.
- Specific proposals - P&R at new towns such as Bourn Airfield and Cambourne, build a new road from Huntingdon across to Newmarket, include projects along River Cam.

Preferred Approach and Reasons	Include a comprehensive policy in the Local Plan requiring development to improve or make provision for infrastructure and services, including provision for their future maintenance and upkeep, compatible with the nature and scale of development. The policy wording needs to be able to accommodate the future introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy and allow for cross-boundary issues to be addressed.
	Clear support for inclusion of a policy to require development to provide appropriate infrastructure, with recognition that there is an existing shortfall of provision which needs to be addressed. Also suggestions made to lobby Government for national investment and/or a period of consolidation is required before further development.
	Current policy requires suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms, including a requirement for future maintenance and upkeep of facilities. This is related to the nature and scale of the development and its potential impact. This approach is 'sound' and consistent with the NPPF. Development should provide the necessary infrastructure to ensure it mitigates its own impacts and is acceptable in planning terms. The wording of the policy needs to be flexible enough to allow for the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy and/or use of Section 106 agreements to secure necessary infrastructure.
	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. The Council will work closely with the Children's Services Authority to ensure development mitigates any impact on school provision appropriately.
	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, to ensure appropriate mechanisms are in place to mitigate the impact of housing on schools provision, which goes beyond merely providing capital funding due to the constraints on some existing schools sites.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy TI/8: Infrastructure and New Developments Policy TI/9: Education Facilities

Policy TI/8: Infrastructure and New Developments (and paragraph 10.36)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 17 Support: 5 (including 3 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 12 (including 3 from PC)
Main Issues	**Support** **Caldecote & Cambourne PCs** – Criterion 1 is vital for the proposals of new development. **Fulbourn PC** – support this policy to ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands. **Hertfordshire County Council** – Where development is proposed close to Royston may require contributions to mitigate impacts on Royston schools. **Natural England** – Support requirement for developers to demonstrate improvement or provision of infrastructure. Note contributions may also be required towards future maintenance and upkeep in accordance with Government guidance. **Object** **Caldecote & Cambourne PCs** – Criterion 2 should read "will" not "may" - contributions towards maintenance are essential to allow communities to take on the infrastructure necessary. **Cambridge Past, Present and Future** – Key infrastructure provision to be supported through CIL should include community assets. Support for Green Infrastructure. **Harlton PC** – Insufficient information in the proposals for the needs of a community and adjacent communities. No reference to availability of public utilities. **Highways Agency** - No reference to A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvement within Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS). Clarify how it will be taken forward and whether it has implications on deliverability of Local Plan. IDS includes improvement to A14 Histon Interchange, but no costs or funding gap specified. Further information needed in update. **Middle Level Commissioners** – Costs for flood defence works and SuDS do not need to be included in tariff, but may need to include maintenance. - Require funds for infrastructure to be met by S106 and CIL money. Provision of essential infrastructure must be in place before house building starts. Provide critical mass of residents faster so essential facilities and services are put in earlier. - Policy does not address deliverability of sites where new infrastructure required. NPPF clear that reliance should not be

	placed on major infrastructure to deliver sites. • Council should ensure viability and deliverability. Sites in plan should not be subject to scale of obligations / policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is compromised.
Assessment	Policy based on policy from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, found sound through the examination. Policy TI/8 requires suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. It provides flexibility over their nature, scale and phasing, related to the form of the development and its potential impact upon the surrounding area. Contributions may be needed towards future maintenance and upkeep of facilities, depending upon their nature and future ownership. It may not be appropriate to require such contributions in all instances. Planning obligations will still be sought where a particular impact specific to an individual development needs to be mitigated. Wider infrastructure improvements that enable more development to take place, but not necessarily attributable to one particular development, will be funded through CIL receipts. This approach is compliant with (i) CIL Regulations which seek to prevent tariff style planning obligation policies and (ii) National Planning Practice Guidance. Timing of infrastructure is of significant importance, although this needs to be balanced by ensuring the ability to develop viably is not threatened. Local authorities often assist by forward funding infrastructure on the basis of future section 106 contributions. The Infrastructure Delivery Study is a live document, subject to regular review; at such time new schemes and detail can be added, such as in relation to the A14 Histon interchange and A428 improvement. Transport infrastructure is high on the agenda with recent changes meaning the LEP (Local Enterprise Partnership) will be making decisions on transport priorities and funding in future. Current discussions on a City Deal, if agreed, will mean the local area keeping a share of the additional tax income that will be generated as a result of future growth.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	**No change**

Paragraphs 10.45 & 10.46 Waste Infrastructure

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Paragraphs 10.45 & 10.46 Waste Infrastructure</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Submission Representations Received</td>
<td>Total: 3
Support: 2
Object: 1 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Issues</td>
<td>

Support
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** – Welcome inclusion of reference to Minerals and Waste Plan and policies regarding areas of search, safeguarding and consultation zones.

Object
- **Bourn PC** – Concerned that Policies Map Inset 11 for Bourn – mineral classification is incorrect.

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Information shown on the Policies Map accurately shows the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework produced by Cambridgeshire County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach in Submission Local Plan</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</table>

Policy TI/9: Education Facilities

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy TI/8Infrastructure and New Development

Policy TI/9: Education Facilities	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 10 Support: 4 (Including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 6 (including 1 from PC)
Main Issues	**Support** • **Cambridgeshire County Council** – Policy is appropriate and encouraging that educational facilities are being supported in locations that are accessible and experience growth. Proposals within Plan have potential for appropriate mitigation, where required. Coherent approach with less disruption for schools. • **Fulbourn PC** - Ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands. • **Suffolk County Council** – Welcome recognition of the need to secure cross-border contributions as appropriate. • Should also cover all housing developments where education facilities have not been explicitly mentioned. **Object** • **Harlton PC** – Insufficient information in the proposals for the needs other than housing of a community and adjacent communities. No reference to future school provision to be provided by Cambridgeshire County Council. • **Sport England** – No objection in principle, but development on educational sites should minimise impact on sports facilities. • More schools needed if there is to be a big population growth. Must tackle problem before it arises and reduce traffic problem by preventing children being driven to school. • Criterion 3 is insufficiently strongly stated, merely 'suggesting' developers work with the CSA to ensure timely provision.
Assessment	New policy to assist in the provision of education facilities. Together with Policy TI/8, Policy TI/9 ensures appropriate mechanisms are in place to mitigate the impact of housing on schools provision, which goes beyond merely providing capital funding due to the constraints on some existing schools sites. Policy SC/9 seeks to protect existing recreation areas therefore it is not necessary to repeat this in Policy TI/9.

	Minor change to strengthen criterion 3, requiring consultation with the Children's Services Authority.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	**Minor change** Amend criterion 3 as follows: 'Developers ~~should~~ **must** engage with the Children's Services Authority at the earliest opportunity…'

Policy TI/10: Broadband

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 65	Broadband
Key evidence	• South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2010 • Cambridge Cluster at 50 Study
Existing policies	N/a
Analysis	The Council's Economic Development Strategy highlighted uneven delivery of broadband across the district as an issue affecting business competitiveness and economic productivity in the district. Provision of quality broadband is particularly important for rural areas, for community integration to help ensure a vibrant rural economy and assist with farm diversification and for home working. The Strategy includes the objective to improve utilities and infrastructure (e.g. Broadband and ICT) in the District for residents and employers, including those located in the new communities and rural locations. The Northstowe Area Action Plan seeks broadband provision for the new town but currently the same approach is not applied across the rural parts of the district. **Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:** The Plan could require provision for broadband (such as ducting for cables) should be designed and installed as an integral part of development, which minimises visual impact and future disturbance during maintenance. All telecommunications infrastructure should be capable of responding to changes in technology requirements over the period of the development.
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	**Question 65:** Do you think that the Local Plan should include a policy seeking provision for broadband infrastructure in new developments?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Ensuring developments can accommodate broadband, would have a positive impact on economic objectives. It could also support home working, which could have a positive impact on sustainable travel by reducing the need to travel to work.
Representations Received	Support:48 Object: 1 Comment: 4
Key Issues from Representations	**SUPPORT:** • Needs to be high-speed e.g. 100mbs • Should require fibre optic connection, not just ducting. • High tech companies rely on high speed broadband to remain competitive and in the forefront of their chosen field. • This is essential to avoid communities with poor broadband

Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal (March 2014)
Annex A – Audit Trail

	speed becoming blighted because working from home is not an option. • Supports working from home and reduces need to travel. • The policy should be very specific and request that all new build must have fibre connected • Support from 21 Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council. **OBJECTIONS:** • No need for a policy.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	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. As a minimum, this would include suitable ducting to the public highway that can accept fibre optic cabling. Broadband is considered an important infrastructure element in the District, highlighted by the Council's Economic Development Strategy, and the issues and options consultation responses. It is important that the plan facilitates provision. A number of representors considered the policy should require specific forms of provision, but it is considered this would be unreasonable. The policy is therefore focused on facilitating its provision by ensuring infrastructure is available to avoid expensive and disruptive retrofitting.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy TI/10: Broadband

Policy TI/10: Broadband	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 5 Support: 3 (including 2 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 2 (including 1 from PC)
Main Issues	**Support** • **Fulbourn PC** – Support this policy to ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands. • **Great Abington PC** – Support policy and recognise high speed infrastructure is essential to maintain our community as a desirable place to live. Current speeds is limiting self employed people working from home. • Support as fast and reliable access to the internet will soon be essential for citizens to fully participate in the community.

	Object • **Ickleton PC** – Want to see solid proposals for broadband improvement in Ickleton Parish coming forward. • **Mobile Operators Association** – New clear and flexible criteria based telecommunications policy should be included.
Assessment	New policy arising from representations to the Issues and Options consultation to assist in the implementation of the broadband. Many premises in Ickleton are included within the Connecting Cambridgeshire programme. By the end of 2015, there will be improvements that will enable many homes and businesses to receive superfast broadband speeds (minimum 24Mbps) or fibre broadband speeds of between 2Mbps and 24Mbps. No need to include a specific Telecoms policy - proposed wording does not add anything to the existing guidance contained in section 5 of the NPPF and/or other policies within the Local Plan, such as Policy HQ/1: Design Principles.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	**No change**