

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

**Matters and Issues for South Cambridgeshire Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter SC2 Climate Change**

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Chapter 4

**Issues:**

**2A Policy CC/1: Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change**

- i. Should the policy give greater clarity as to the particular matters which the Council would be expect to be included in a Sustainability Statement (SS)?
- ii. Should the quantity of information required in a SS be proportionate to the nature and scale of the particular proposed development? If so, should the policy indicate appropriate thresholds?
- iii. Would the SS specifically exclude matters which would be controlled under the Building Regulations?

**2B Policy CC/2: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation**

- i. Is the Policy, as proposed to be modified, consistent with the Written Ministerial Statement dated 18 June 2015?
- ii. In light of the Written Ministerial Statement, is the Council intending to identify any areas in the Plan where wind energy generation would be suitable in principle?
- iii. Should criterion 1(b) also refer to off-site (allowable) solutions e.g. direct connection to associated development or a community energy generation project? In this regard is the policy too restrictive in not enabling applicants to take the initiative in respect of the delivery of allowable solutions?
- iv. Having regard to Question B(i) above, is the prescribing of a minimum distance in paragraph 2 justifiable? Should each case be treated on its own merits and the appropriate minimum separation distance be determined through the planning application process?

**2C Policy CC/3: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments**

- i. Does the policy accord with the provisions of the Deregulation Act 2015 which requires that local planning authorities should not set any additional local technical standards or

## **Local Plan Examinations**

### **Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

requirements relating to the construction or performance of new dwellings?

- ii. Having regard to the blanket 10% carbon emissions reduction (CER) requirement over and above the Building Regulations, does the policy accord with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and current Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) paragraph 009 Ref ID: 6-009-20150327 which states that "*local requirements should form part of a Local Plan following engagement with appropriate partners, and will need to be based on robust and credible evidence and pay careful attention to viability*". Should the policy therefore include a proviso relating to the effect on the viability of a proposal?
- iii. Is the policy too inflexible in prescribing that the CER has to be achieved solely through on-site renewable energy technologies? Should the initiative for achieving compliance with the principle of the policy rest with the applicant?
- iv. In seeking to achieve the CER, should the policy adopt a fabric first approach in preference to on-site renewable energy technologies or integrated systems/site wide solutions?

#### **2D Policy CC/4: Sustainable Design and Construction**

- i. Does the policy, as proposed to be modified, now accord with the new standards introduced following the Written Ministerial Letter dated 25 March 2015 and the subsequent government 'Fixing the Foundations' document and with the provisions of PPG paragraphs 014 Ref ID: 56-014-20150327 and 015 Ref ID: 56-015-20150327 which indicate that "*where there is a clear local need then a local planning authority can set out Local Plan policies requiring new (housing) developments to meet the tighter Building Regulations' optional water efficiency requirement of 110 litres/person/day*"?
- ii. Does the criterion 2 accord with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) 009 Ref ID: 6-009-20150327? Should the policy therefore take full account of the potential effect on the viability of a proposal?

#### **2E Policy CC/5: Sustainable Show Homes**

- i. Does the policy accord with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) 009 Ref ID: 6-009-20150327 [as set out in question C(i) above]? Is there credible and robust evidence to justify the policy? Should the policy take full account of the potential effect on the viability of a proposal?
- ii. Are criteria 2 and 3 consistent with national policy which places the initiative with the developer to choose how carbon reduction targets are met rather than the end user?
- iii. Would criterion 3 be enforceable? What would constitute an 'unreasonable premium' and how would it be quantified?

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

**2F Policy CC/6: Construction Methods**

- i. Is the policy justified as currently worded? Should criterion 4 be made more flexible and proportionate by setting out a development quantum threshold (e.g. the threshold for major development) below which the submission of supporting documents for a proposal would not be required?

**2G Policy CC/8: Sustainable Drainage Systems**

- i. Should the policy set out the arrangements for the future management of SuDS for large scale settlements and urban extensions?

**2H Policy CC/9: Managing Flood Risk**

- i. Should criterion 1(a) clarify that re-development sites should adopt the same approach to surface water drainage as undeveloped sites?
- ii. Is the requirement in criterion 1(a) for floor levels to be 300mm above adjacent highway levels realistic/relevant given that in some areas of the district the site levels may be significantly lower than the highway? Should the requirement relating to the 1:100 year flood level take precedent?
- iii. Would criterion 1(c) have the effect of seeking to restrict the surface water run-off rates for new developments on all sites, including brownfield sites, to below the equivalent greenfield run off rates for an undeveloped site? If so, is this realistic and achievable?
- iv. Should paragraph 4.37 also include Internal Drainage Boards as consultees?
- v. Should the policy provide detailed guidance in respect of:
  - water supply and discharge safety issues; and
  - the complex structure of stakeholders and the duties of statutory authorities in the application process; and the design, operation and management regimes?or could such guidance be delegated to a SPD?

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

**Matters and Issues for South Cambridgeshire Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter SC5A Delivering High Quality Homes-Residential Site Allocations**

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Chapter 7, Policies H/1 to H/5

**Preamble:**

- 1) A separate hearing has already been/will be held to consider the omission sites that have been promoted by representors but have not been included within the residential allocations in the Plan. Accordingly this hearing will focus solely on the allocated sites contained in Policies H/1 to H/5.
- 2) The development of Green Belt land has already been considered in Matter 6: *Green Belt* (Policy S/4: Cambridge Green Belt) and Matter PM2 so this matter will not be an issue for discussion at this hearing.

**Issues:**

**Policy H/1: Allocations for Residential Development at Villages**

**SC5A.1 Site Reference: H/1:a-Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston**

- i. Would the proposed vehicular access to the site from Wakelin Avenue provide the most appropriate arrangement in terms of highway/traffic considerations?
- ii. Would the existing tree belt located to the rear of Broadmeadows/Fairfields be retained if the proposed allocation was to proceed?
- iii. What, if any, would be the implications in terms of developing part of the site for residential purposes if Cambridge City FC relocates to Sawston?
- iv. Is the housing trajectory for the site as indicated in Figure 3 of the Plan realistic?
- v. Is the location of the site within the setting of the Grade II\* listed Pampisford Hall?
- vi. Does the site represent a sustainable location in terms of its proximity to local facilities and services, and accessibility to sustainable modes of transport?
- vii. Would the allocation result in the unacceptable loss of employment land in this location?
- viii. Should the development requirements also refer to the need for a land contamination report?

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

- ix. Could the impacts on the existing physical, social and educational infrastructure in Sawston as a consequence of the development of the site be adequately mitigated?

**SC5A.2 Site Reference H/1:b-Land North of Babraham Road, Sawston**

- i. Does the site represent a sustainable location in terms of its proximity to local facilities and services, and accessibility to sustainable modes of transport?
- ii. Could the impacts on the existing physical, social and educational infrastructure in Sawston as a consequence of the development of the site be adequately mitigated?
- iii. Is the location of the site within the setting of the Grade II\* listed Pampisford Hall?
- iv. Would the development of the site result in the loss of good quality agricultural land and wildlife habitats?
- v. What, if any, would be the implications in terms of the development of the site if Cambridge City FC relocates to Sawston?

**SC5A.3 Site Reference H/1:c-Land South of Babraham Road**

- i. Does the site represent a sustainable location in terms of its proximity to local facilities and services, and accessibility to sustainable modes of transport?
- ii. Could the impacts on the existing physical, social and educational infrastructure in Sawston as a consequence of the development of the site be adequately mitigated?
- iii. Is the location of the site within the setting of the Grade II\* listed Pampisford Hall?
- iv. Would the development of the site result in the loss of good quality agricultural land and wildlife habitats?
- v. What, if any, would be the implications in terms of the development of the site if Cambridge City FC relocates to Sawston?

**SC5A.4 Site Reference H/1:d-Land North of Impington Lane, Histon & Impington**

- i. What proportion of the site is within flood zone 1?
- ii. Would the location and configuration of the site enable the creation of an acceptable access arrangement in the context of highway safety?
- iii. Could the impacts on the existing physical, social and educational infrastructure in Histon & Impington as a consequence of the development of the site be adequately mitigated?
- iv. Would the future occupiers of the site be adversely affected by traffic noise emanating from the A14?

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

**SC5A.8 Policy H/2: Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton**

- i. Should paragraph 7.12 be updated to reflect the latest position in relation to planning applications?
- ii. In respect of paragraph 7.13, is it the intention of the policy that the future redevelopment of the waste water treatment works and the recreation buildings would be restricted to uses which would not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt?

**SC5A.9 Policy H/3: Papworth Everard West Central**

- i. Would the scale of redevelopment on the site require mitigation measures to the A428/A1198 junction?

**SC5A.10 Policy H/4: Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate**

- i. Does the modified policy now accord with the Written Ministerial Statement dated 25 March 2015?

**SC5A.11 Policy H/5 South of A1307, Linton**

- i. In the context of the sustainability of the site's location, is there a significant difference in this regard to the Old Police Station site which has been granted planning permission for residential development (S/2420/12)?

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

**Matters and Issues for South Cambridgeshire Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter SC5B–Delivering High Quality Homes-Development Management**

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Chapter 7, Policies H/6 to H/18

**Preamble**

- 1) Policies H/19 to H/22 will be the subject of a separate hearing.

**SC5B.1 Policy H/7: Housing Density**

- i. Is the wording of the policy too inflexible and prescriptive having regard to paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)?  
Should the average densities be regarded as guidelines with the density of individual sites being determined in the context of their location, the character of the surrounding area and the particular site circumstances?

**SC5B.2 Policy H/8: Housing Mix**

- i. Does the policy accord with paragraph 50 of the Framework which requires a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends and the needs of different groups in the community? Is the wording of the policy therefore too inflexible and prescriptive?
- ii. Should the percentages in criteria (a) to (c) be reduced and the flexibility allowance in criteria (d) increased?
- iii. Is the requirement set out in Section 2(c) of the policy too onerous and too inflexible?
- iv. Is the paragraph 3 of the policy justified as the Written Ministerial Statement dated 25 March 2015 requires that Councils should not set in their emerging Local Plans any requirements relating the performance of buildings?
- v. Should Policy H/8 and Policy H/10 enable the development of starter and self-build homes on rural exception sites?

**SC5B.3 Policy H/9: Affordable Housing**

- i. Would the threshold of 3 dwellings and a 40% affordable housing requirement adversely affect the viability of small scale residential development?
- ii. Has the interrelationship between the affordable housing requirement in the policy and the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy tariffs been tested in terms of its effect on development viability?

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

- iii. Is there sound justification for a common requirement for affordable housing provision across the whole of the district?
- iv. Is the wording of criterion (f) in paragraph 2 of the policy consistent with the wording of criterion (e)?
- v. What status will the current Affordable Housing SPD have in relation to the Plan? Is the SPD consistent with the Plan?

**SC5B.4 Policy H/10: Rural Exception Site Affordable Housing**

- i. Having regard to the requirements of paragraph 54 of the Framework, should the policy demonstrate a more flexible and positive approach towards allowing an element of market housing on rural exception sites in order to address housing needs in villages?

**SC5B.5 Policy H/11: Residential Space Standards for Market Housing**

- i. Do the internal residential space standards set out in the policy accord with the DCLG *Technical housing standards-nationally described space standard* document published in March 2015?
- ii. The Written Ministerial Letter dated 25 March 2015 indicates that the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the Framework.  
Has the need for compliance with the minimum space standards been clearly demonstrated?

**SC5B.6 Policy H/13: Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside**

- i. Should the policy restrict the size of future extensions to a replacement dwelling?

**SC5B.7 Policy H/14: Countryside Dwellings of Exceptional Quality**

- i. Is the Green Belt restriction necessary? Should the Council rely on the requirements of national Green Belt policy in the Framework to control any such development?

**SC5B.8 Policy H/15: Development of Residential Gardens**

- i. Should criterion (a) refer to Policy H/13 rather than Policy H/7?

**SC5B.9 Policy H/16: Reuse of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use**

- i. Is the requirement for a 12 month marketing exercise in criterion (a) of the policy consistent with the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point of paragraph 55 of the Framework?
- ii. Should the policy also make reference to the most viable re-use of heritage assets and enabling development to heritage assets having regard to the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point of paragraph 55 of the Framework?



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

**Matters and Issues for South Cambridgeshire Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter SC8 Promoting Successful Communities**

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Chapter 9

**Preamble**

- 1) Omission sites (i.e. sites which are being promoted as new allocations for sport/leisure/recreation use but have not been included in the Plan) have been considered/will be considered at a separate hearing and will not therefore be considered under this Matter.

**SC8A Policy SC/1: Allocation for Open Spaces**

- i. Allocation 1(a) Over: Is there justification for all of the land to be allocated for open space?
- ii. Allocation 1(d) Swavesey: Would the allocation result in an over concentration of open space in the northern part of the village? Is there a reasonable prospect that the site would be deliverable during the lifetime of the Plan? Should alternative options for expanding the area of open space adjacent to the village green be explored?
- iii. Allocation 1(e) Great Shelford: Would this allocation address any shortfall in open space provision identified in the Council's Recreation and Open Space Study (2013)? Is there a reasonable prospect of this site being delivered in the lifetime of the Plan?
- iv. Allocation 2(g) Histon: Is the site in an appropriate location for use as open space in terms of amenity and highway safety considerations given its proximity to neighbouring residential development and the B1049?
- v. Has the Council given consideration to the need for a recreation ground site allocation in Dry Drayton?
- vi. Has the Council carried out any evaluation of the potential site abutting the existing recreation ground in Fulbourn?
- vii. Has the Council given consideration to the need for an informal recreation area in Graveley?
- viii. Does the policy taken account of the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards referred to in paragraph 3.11 of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy?

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

**SC8B Policy SC/2: Health Impact Assessment**

- i. Should the first line of the policy require new development to have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of new and existing residents or does it seek to acknowledge that this will always be the case? Should the word "will" be replaced by "shall"?
- ii. Does the policy conflict with paragraph 122 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)? Would the policy place an unnecessary burden on applicants having regard to paragraph 173 of the Framework?
- iii. What will be the scope of the proposed SPD?

**SC8C Policy SC/3: Protection of Village Services and Facilities**

- i. In the interests of completeness, should paragraph 1 of the policy make reference to all of the local services and community facilities indicated in the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point of paragraph 28 of the Framework?

**SC8D Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs**

- i. Is the policy consistent with the adopted Northstowe Area Action Plan (NAAP)? If not, should the policy contain an exclusion in respect of previously adopted AAP?
- ii. Should the policy indicate how the Council would respond to proposals for sub-regional community, sports and leisure facilities? Is it still the Councils' joint intention to explore suitable sites for a community stadium, ice rink and concert hall or rather to consider any future planning applications for such facilities on their own merits?
- iii. Is the list of community facilities and services contained in paragraph 4 of the policy indicative or exhaustive? Should the list be read in the context of paragraph 2 of the policy as the provision of some of the facilities may have to be considered at a District-wide level rather than through a single development proposal?
- iv. Should the policy make specific reference to supporting the provision of facilities which would enable greater participation in football e.g. in respect of the Football Association's disabled persons, females, youth and veteran categories; and for purely recreational purposes?
- v. Should paragraph 9.10 of the supporting text clarify that infrastructure contributions would be secured through an approved Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) unless the CIL indicates a nil contribution where such contributions could be the subject of negotiation and included in a section 106 agreement?

**SC8E Policy SC/5: Hospice Provision**

- i. Should the policy 9 (and possibly its title) be broadened to include wider community healthcare facilities? Should the policy acknowledge the need for a hospice to be located

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

close to an acute hospital and the increasing role of hospices in community healthcare provision as well as end of life care?

**SC8F Policy SC/6: Indoor Community Facilities**

- i. Are the requirements for new community space provision too onerous?
- ii. Should paragraph 3 of the policy and/or paragraph 9.21 of the supporting text clarify that infrastructure contributions would be secured through an approved Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) unless the CIL indicates a nil contribution where such contributions could be the subject of negotiation and included in a section 106 agreement?

**SC8G Policy SC/7: Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments**

- i. Should paragraph 9.26 of the supporting text clarify that infrastructure contributions would be secured through an approved Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) unless the CIL indicates a nil contribution where such contributions could be the subject of negotiation and included in a section 106 agreement?
- ii. What will be the scope the proposed Open Space SPD?

**SC8H Policy SC/8: Open Space Standards**

- i. The policy indicates that the proposed standards are expressed as minima. Does this mean that there would be no grounds for negotiation for individual sites along the lines of the last sentence of paragraph 9.28 in the supporting text to Policy SC/7?
- ii. Should the policy contain an exclusion in respect of previously adopted AAPs (e.g. the Northstowe AAP) which require the provision of a lower minimum standard of open space?
- iii. As Policy SC/7 is the enabling policy for securing the level of open space provision set out in Policy SC/8 for all housing developments, does it serve any purpose to repeat the information contained in paragraph 9.26 in the supporting text of this policy?

**SC8I Policy SC/9: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas, Allotments and Community Orchards**

- i. Does the absence of an up to date playing pitch assessment weaken the effectiveness of the policy?

**SC8J Policy SC/10: Lighting Proposals**

- i. Is the policy in conflict with paragraph 122 of the Framework? Should paragraph 9.38 of the supporting text clarify that the reference to the 'NPPF' is taken directly from paragraph 125 of the document?
- ii. Should the policy also make direct reference to the impact of light pollution on wildlife and their habitats in countryside locations and on the settings of heritage assets?

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

**SC8K Policy SC/11: Noise Pollution**

- i. Is the policy in conflict with paragraph 122 of the Framework? Should paragraph 9.44 of the supporting text clarify that the reference to the 'NPPF' is taken directly from paragraph 123 of the document?
- ii. What will be the scope of the proposed Environmental SPD referred to in paragraph 9.52?

**SC8L Policy SC/12: Contaminated Land**

- i. Is the policy in conflict with paragraph 122 of the Framework? Should paragraph 9.54 of the supporting text clarify that the reference to the 'NPPF' relates to paragraph 120 of the document?
- ii. Should the policy also make reference to landfill gas contamination?
- iii. Should the policy also make reference to groundwater contamination?
- iv. Should the policy make reference to development on aquifers and EU designated Source Protection Zones?

**SC8M Policy SC/13: Air Quality**

- i. Is the policy in conflict with paragraph 122 of the Framework? Should the policy make direct reference to paragraph 124 of the Framework?
- ii. Should the policy continue to promote the Quality Bus Partnership and require that buses should conform to European Emission Code Level 5 as a minimum requirement?

**SC8N Policy SC/14: Hazardous Installations**

- i. Is the policy in conflict with paragraph 122 of the Framework?

**SC8P Policy SC/15: Odour and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air**

- i. Is the policy in conflict with paragraph 122 of the Framework? Should the policy make direct reference to paragraph 124 of the Framework?