

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan



Examination in Public
October – December 2002



Report of the Panel



February 2003

CONTENTS

Page Number

	Preface	
CHAPTER 1	Panel Overview	1
CHAPTER 2	Development Strategy	6
CHAPTER 3	Deliverability of the Strategy	13
CHAPTER 4	Employment	22
CHAPTER 5	Housing	33
CHAPTER 6	Transport	55
CHAPTER 7	Cambridge Sub-Region	82
CHAPTER 8	Green Belt	99
CHAPTER 9	New Settlement	127
CHAPTER 10	Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire	149
CHAPTER 11	Rural Issues	157
CHAPTER 12	Summary of Panel Recommendations	167
APPENDIX A	List of Issues and Participants	
APPENDIX B	Programme	
APPENDIX C	Core Documents	
APPENDIX D	List of SPA Supplementary Statements	
APPENDIX E	Abbreviations used in Report	

PREFACE

1. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Structure Plan Review: Deposit Draft Plan 2002, 'Planning for Success' is intended to replace the existing Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 1995 which was adopted in December 1995. Throughout this report we have used the shorthand 'Structure Plan' to refer to the new draft Plan and the terms 'adopted' or 'existing' Structure Plan to refer to the 1995 Plan.
2. The draft Structure Plan was placed on deposit for consultation purposes from 11 March – 22 April 2002. As a result, approximately 800 responses were received from individuals, bodies and groups comprising some 3,000 separate statements of support or objection. In addition, nearly 800 petition style responses were received relating to various issues.
3. We were appointed by the First Secretary of State to conduct an Examination in Public (EIP) of selected issues arising out of the Structure Plan. Based on the objections and representations received, seven main issues were selected by the Structure Plan Authorities for examination, in consultation with the Panel. We were also consulted on the choice of participants at the EIP. In total 114 participants were invited, with 102 taking up their invitations.
4. The List of Issues and Participants is reproduced as Appendix A to this report. All participants were given the opportunity to submit statements prior to the EIP and these were circulated in advance to all those participating in the relevant sessions. Statements prepared by the Structure Plan Authorities were likewise circulated. Written statements submitted by those who were invited but unable to attend and those to whom we were unable to issue an invitation have also been taken into account. A Library was available both prior to and during the EIP where copies of all statements and other relevant Core Documents were available for inspection. A list of the Core Documents (CDs) is at Appendix C.
5. A Preliminary Meeting took place on 6 September 2002. Its purpose was to explain the nature of the proceedings and to allow an opportunity for the Panel to address any questions on how the EIP would be run. The EIP was held over a period of five and a half weeks, between 29 October and 4 December 2002. The detailed programme is at Appendix B.
6. In October 2002, at the Panel's request the Structure Plan Authorities produced a schedule of proposed changes to the Structure Plan, based on an initial analysis of the objections and representations (now listed as SPA Supplement 11 and also CD 1.2.2). Similarly, during the EIP the Structure Plan Authorities provided some further re-drafting of the policies and text of the Plan, together with responses to particular issues raised in discussion. These are listed as SPA Supplements in Appendix D and are specifically referred to where appropriate in this report.
7. An important policy context for the Structure Plan and for our report is provided by regional planning guidance. RPG6, the Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia (CD 4.1), was published in November 2000. This will be superseded by the emerging Regional Planning Guidance for the East of England (RPG14). A consultation document on options, 'Your region, your choice, your future' was published in September 2002 (CD 4.1.2) and has been referred to in this report where appropriate.

8. The Panel spent two days prior to the EIP touring the Plan area, including visiting locations relevant to the matters being examined. Further visits took place during and after the EIP.
9. All of the sessions at the EIP were tape recorded; copies of the tapes can be made available, on request, from the Structure Plan Authorities.

Structure and Content of the Report

10. The chapters in the rest of this report address the issues considered at the EIP. In each chapter the Panel has set the context by summarising the Structure Plan's provisions relevant to each matter and identifying the main issues arising. We have not sought to provide a full account of all the proceedings during the EIP, or to summarise all the representations and participants' statements. The report concentrates upon the main arguments we have considered and upon setting out the reasoning behind our conclusions and recommendations. We have made some minor changes to the wording of Policies where this will improve the Plan.
11. The chapters follow, broadly, the sequence of the EIP and our recommendations for changes to the Structure Plan are contained within each chapter. For ease of understanding Chapter 12 details all of our recommendations in the order in which they would appear in the Structure Plan and provides the SPAs with the full text of any policies to which we are recommending changes.
12. A list of the abbreviations used in the report is at Appendix E. In each chapter, a main heading is denoted in capitals, a sub heading in lower case and sub-sub headings in italics, all in bold. Any further sub headings are in unbolded lower case text.

PANEL

- Chairman: Mr Ian H Crowther BA(Hons), DipTP, MRTPI (retd)
Former Director of Planning, Transport and the Environment in the Government
Office for the Yorkshire and Humber Region
- Inspector: Mrs Leonora J Rozee BA(Hons) MRTPI
Principal Housing and Planning Inspector from the Planning Inspectorate
- Assisted by: Mr Nicholas Matthews MTCP MRTPI
Planning Officer from the Planning Inspectorate
- Mr Ray Machole BA(Hons) MA MRTPI
Planning Officer from the Planning Inspectorate
- Secretariat: Panel Secretary: Mrs Pam Perceval-Maxwell
Programme Officer: Mr Bill Furness-Gibbon
Assistant Programme Officer: Ms Angela Miller

CHAPTER 1

PANEL OVERVIEW

- 1.1 In this chapter we provide a broad overview of the Panel's key conclusions and recommendations and offer some general comments on issues which, whilst not directly related to the contents of the Structure Plan, fundamentally affect its implementation and the future planning of the area. Our detailed recommendations on changes to the Plan are set out within each chapter of the report and are brought together in Plan order in Chapter 12.
- 1.2 Most of what we have to say here relates to the Cambridge Sub-Region. This is because it is in the Cambridge Sub-Region where the biggest shift in the future scale and pattern of development, compared with existing policies, is called for. It is not surprising, therefore, that the policies and proposals related to the Sub-Region attracted the greatest volume of representations on the Structure Plan and prompted the longest debates at the EIP.
- 1.3 By contrast, the strategy for Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire is already fairly well established and attracted little controversy. Existing land commitments can largely accommodate the scale of development envisaged within the Plan period and there is therefore neither the scope nor the need for a major shift in development patterns.

CAMBRIDGE SUB-REGION

- 1.4 Firstly, it is worth remarking upon the large number of background studies and the extent of analytical work which lie behind the proposals in the Structure Plan. The Cambridge Sub-Region is certainly an area which has been more thoroughly researched than most.
- 1.5 Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia (RPG6) sets a clear course for the Structure Plan to follow. The RPG6 policies are based on a recognition of the importance of the Cambridge Sub-Region to the national and regional economy and the urgency of moving towards a more sustainable and spatially concentrated pattern of development. It seeks a better balance between housing and jobs whilst allowing the Sub-Region to develop as a world leader in research and technology based industries and in higher education. It also lays emphasis on the need to protect and enhance the historic character and setting of Cambridge and the environmental qualities of the surrounding area.
- 1.6 RPG6 also sets the scene for two important follow-up studies which have informed the preparation of the Structure Plan and provided important background information for the EIP. The first of these is the Cambridge Sub-Region Study prepared by Colin Buchanan and Partners for the Standing Conference of East Anglian Local Authorities (CD 2.1). The second is a study into Implementing the Cambridge Sub-Regional Study by Roger Tym and Partners (CD 2.5).
- 1.7 In addition there is a veritable library of studies into more detailed issues affecting the Sub-Region. These include: a series of important Green Belt studies; the Cambridge-Huntingdon Multi-Modal Study (CHUMMS) and various other transport studies; the Cambridge Urban Capacity Study; research by the University of Cambridge into affordable and key worker housing; and a number of studies commissioned by the East of England Development Agency (EEDA) into employment and economic development matters, including business 'clusters'.

- 1.8 Much of this material was available to inform the local planning authorities in their own analyses leading up to the preparation of the Structure Plan. Other documents became available only shortly before the EIP started and have therefore informed deliberations subsequently. In addition, there were a great many documents submitted by participants as supporting evidence to their written statements to the EIP. All of this material is listed in the Core Documents (CDs) at Appendix C.
- 1.9 Although the assimilation of all this material and the assessment of its importance has been a major task for the Panel and other participants, it has served to provide a considerable degree of confidence that the policies and proposals in the Structure Plan are built upon a good foundation of research and analysis. It has also helped greatly to inform both the debate at the EIP and the Panel's own recommendations.

Summary of Panel's Conclusions

- 1.10 Overall, we consider that the strategy and proposals for the Cambridge Sub-Region, as set out in the Structure Plan, are broadly appropriate and in line with RPG6. In our recommendations we have:
- offered a modified vision and strategy for the Sub-Region which does not change the substance of what the Structure Plan says but suggests ways in which it can be clarified and re-presented;
 - put forward a revised vision and purpose for the Cambridge Green Belt, based upon the concept of Cambridge retaining its existing character as a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic core;
 - supported the proposed major development locations involving releases of land from the Green Belt, with the exception of the proposed eastern expansion beyond Cambridge Airport, which we consider would not accord with the above concept of a compact city;
 - identified scope for additional sustainable capacity on the edge of the city in an area of the Green Belt west of Trumpington Road, which will provide greater flexibility in the development strategy and opportunities for longer term growth;
 - endorsed the choice of Longstanton/Oakington as the location for a new settlement with a capacity of between 8,000 and 10,000 dwellings;
 - suggested a review of the capacity for further development at the existing new settlement of Cambourne in order to identify the scope for making that community more sustainable and as a contribution to the longer term development needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region;
 - put forward some modest changes to the presentation of the housing allocations in the Plan to reflect the above recommendations and to provide a little greater flexibility for Local Plans;
 - sought to strengthen and clarify the transport strategy and priorities for the Sub-Region.
- 1.11 Apart from the above, we have made various recommendations aimed at improving and clarifying the policies and the explanatory text of the Plan, drawing upon suggestions made both by participants and the SPAs during the debate. Although not included in our formal recommendations we have also identified Waterbeach as a sustainable location for

a second new settlement (subject to the resolution of transport issues), were one to be required in the longer term.

Implementation

- 1.12 A distinctive feature of this Structure Plan, and of the EIP, has been the emphasis not just on the contents of the strategy but on its deliverability. We have devoted a chapter of our report (Chapter 3) to discussing some of the key issues which have arisen. We wish to draw attention here to three particular aspects: delivery mechanisms, provision of infrastructure, and some statutory issues.

Delivery Mechanisms

- 1.13 Implementing a strategy as wide-ranging, complex and demanding as that for the Cambridge Sub-Region calls for special mechanisms. We were encouraged and impressed at the EIP by the general spirit of co-operation and goodwill on all sides in seeking the best possible plan for the Cambridge area and for carrying it forward. Good progress is being made, under the leadership of Cambridgeshire County Council, in bringing together all the interested parties in a Stakeholder Partnership which will oversee the job of monitoring and managing the implementation of the strategy. We strongly endorse this approach to implementing the Plan.
- 1.14 The Strategy itself will need reviewing, up-dating and rolling forward in future years. Under the new planning arrangements, which will see the demise of the Structure Plan, we envisage that this will take the form of a Sub-Regional Plan for the Cambridge area, forming part of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England. In our view, Cambridgeshire County Council should continue to perform a lead role in preparing, monitoring and managing the implementation of the Sub-Regional Plan.
- 1.15 On a similar note, we welcome the extent of joint working and consultation between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on cross-boundary planning issues affecting Cambridge. This will assume greater importance in future because of the need for careful phasing and management of land releases on the edge of the city, not least because some of the strategic sites straddle the boundary between the two authorities. We have sought to introduce a degree of flexibility into the housing figures in order to reflect this. We were told that work is well advanced on reviewing the two Local Plans, again in close co-operation between the City and District Councils. Under the new planning arrangements it seems to us that there is a good case in the longer term for the two authorities to collaborate in the production of a joint Local Development Framework for the Cambridge area.

Provision of Infrastructure

- 1.16 The challenging development target set by RPG6 for the Cambridge Sub-Region – 2,800 dwellings per annum – calls for a commensurate improvement in transport infrastructure, utilities and a wide range of social and community facilities, notably affordable housing. In addition, there is a considerable infrastructure deficit to be made up, arising from insufficient investment to support past development. The Roger Tym report estimates the total potential costs at around £2,000 million.

- 1.17 Much of the funding for this infrastructure will need to be attracted in the form of developer contributions through planning agreements. We comment further on this in the next section.
- 1.18 However, a high proportion will also be reliant upon Government funding, either directly through investment in trunk roads or indirectly through support for the Local Transport Plan and, in the case of affordable housing, the Housing Corporation. Understandably, the local authorities and others laid great stress on Government playing its role in helping to deliver the strategy, by ensuring that the level of investment needed keeps pace with the rate of development. In a nutshell, having wished the ‘ends’ (through RPG6) it is felt that Government should help to provide the means.
- 1.19 The portents at the present time look promising. A key part of the transport infrastructure, in the form of the A14 corridor improvements proposed in the Cambridge-Huntingdon Multi-Modal Study, has received Government endorsement. Government has also indicated, in the latest Local Transport Capital Expenditure Settlement, that it would be willing to consider the case for the Cambridge to Huntingdon Rapid Transit system before the next settlement, subject to further technical analysis. Above all, Government will be represented on the Stakeholder Partnership, through GO-East.
- 1.20 The Structure Plan contains policies requiring key infrastructure requirements to be secured before development can go ahead. A failure to deliver the infrastructure will therefore slow down the pace at which development can take place and put the strategy at risk. The Panel therefore understands and endorses the emphasis placed by all participants at the EIP on the role of Government in helping to deliver the strategy.

Statutory Issues

- 1.21 As indicated above, developer contributions must also play a major part in delivering the infrastructure to support growth. A novel, but not unique, feature of the arrangements the planning authorities wish to implement is a ‘pooling’ of Section 106 contributions to help fund elements of sub-regional infrastructure, as well as requirements directly associated with the developments in question.
- 1.22 At the EIP doubts were expressed about whether such an approach is compatible with the guidance in Circular 1/97 on Planning Obligations. This is because of the need to demonstrate a ‘necessary, relevant and direct connection’ between any contributions towards infrastructure and the developments proposed. In a situation where major items of infrastructure, including affordable housing, are intended to serve the whole Sub-Region, and where all or most types and scales of development are expected to contribute, demonstrating such connections may be open to challenge.
- 1.23 We are aware that Circular 1/97 is currently subject to review by the Government. The removal of any doubt about the legitimacy of the proposed pooling arrangements would clearly be an important step forward in the implementation of the Plan. A recognition of the need for flexibility in the interpretation of the words ‘necessary’ and ‘directly related to’ in paragraph B2 of the Circular is one way in which this might be achieved. This would help to address circumstances like those of the Cambridge area where there is a clear and compelling requirement to provide infrastructure throughout the Sub-Region to support major growth.
- 1.24 In addition, we understand that Circular 6/98 Planning and Affordable Housing is to be reviewed. In the light of discussion at the EIP, we should like to highlight two issues.

Firstly, the introduction of greater clarity over the relationship between ‘traditional’ affordable housing (i.e. that which is eligible for direct public subsidy), low cost market housing (i.e. owner-occupied housing available for sale at below normal market price through some form of discounting), and the term ‘key worker’ housing would be helpful. Secondly, the opportunity to adopt lower thresholds for the size of sites for which a proportion of affordable housing may be sought would assist authorities in areas like the Cambridge Sub-Region in their efforts to achieve a better balance between affordable and full market housing in the future.

PETERBOROUGH AND NORTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE

- 1.25 As indicated above, the development strategy for the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area is largely fixed for the next 15 years by the extent of existing land commitments, especially in Peterborough itself. The township of Hampton, to the south of Peterborough, is expected to accommodate a substantial portion of the city’s future development requirements, now that it has overcome its slow start. We have endorsed the proposals agreed between the SPAs and the developers for an increase in the design capacity at Hampton, based on increasing the proposed housing densities and a review of the disposition of land uses. This will provide capacity at least until 2016 and probably for some years beyond.
- 1.26 The change in strategy required by RPG6, which sees a lower level of future house building in the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area than in the past, has led to a degree of tension in respect of the distribution of development. In particular, Fenland District Council are concerned that the limitation this imposes on the Structure Plan unduly constrains the aspirations for further growth and economic regeneration in their District, notably in the market towns of Wisbech and March. As a result, the housing figures give little or no flexibility for further land allocations over and above existing commitments.
- 1.27 Whilst Fenland District Council accepted that the current approach is appropriate in the context of the RPG6 guidance, it is clear that the imposition of a somewhat arbitrary 70:30 split in the housing requirement as between the Cambridge Sub-Region and the rest of the Structure Plan area may produce outcomes which are not always regarded as supportable at the local level. We have, however, taken the view that it would be wrong to provide for additional housing if this perpetuated patterns of unsustainable long distance commuting which RPG6 and the Structure Plan are seeking to reverse. Moreover, as we have made clear in our conclusions on this matter, existing land allocations should themselves be reviewed against sustainability criteria to ensure that they are all in the right places.
- 1.28 Nevertheless, we do think that when the broad distribution of housing allocations is reviewed in the forthcoming RPG14, this should be informed by a considered analysis of recent trends in jobs and house building and of commuting patterns in the Structure Plan area. This may justify a reconsideration of the appropriateness of the 70:30 split and provide some greater flexibility for reviewing housing allocations in the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area.

CHAPTER 2

DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

- 2.1 Chapter 1 of the Structure Plan sets out the overall strategic aim of the plan, the sustainable development strategy objectives and the policies relating to these objectives. The chapter also contains the key policies relating to the development strategy.
- 2.2 At the EIP, debate focussed upon Policy P1/1 which sets out the overall approach to development in the Plan area. The first part of the policy identifies those locations where the ‘great majority of land for new development will be sought’. In brief these are:
- within Cambridge and Peterborough;
 - as expansions of these two cities, subject in the case of Cambridge to changes in the Green Belt boundary;
 - in a new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington close to Cambridge;
 - in and adjoining the Market Towns of Chatteris, Ely, Huntingdon, March, St. Ives, St Neots, Wisbech and on a lesser scale Ramsey and Whittlesey.
- 2.3 The second part of the policy sets out a number of selection criteria which should apply to the identification of sites for development at these locations. There is an emphasis within these criteria on the use of previously developed land and locating development where good public transport exists or can be provided.
- 2.4 The final part of the policy allows for a ‘limited scale of the overall development provision’ to take place within Rural Centres, to be identified in Local Plans. Paragraph 1.17 of the supporting text provides a set of general criteria to guide the selection of the Rural Centres. Paragraph 1.18 also recognises that there may be instances where small-scale development may help to meet the local needs of smaller village communities. This is a theme picked up in subsequent rural policies of the Plan, notably Policies P2/6, P3/4 and P5/5 which we deal with in Chapters 4 and 11.
- 2.5 The major issues raised by participants about Policy P1/1 related to:
- the way in which national and regional planning policy guidance has been interpreted and applied, especially in relation to the sequential approach to development;
 - the selection of Longstanton/Oakington as the new settlement location;
 - the identification of the Market Towns;
 - the interpretation and wording of the locational criteria in the second part of the policy;
 - the role and criteria for selection of Rural Centres.

We deal with each of these issues below, with the exception of the new settlement location which we address in Chapter 9. We also refer in more detail in Chapters 7 and 10 to the role of the different Market Towns in the Cambridge Sub-Region and the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area respectively.

CONSISTENCY WITH NATIONAL AND REGIONAL GUIDANCE

- 2.6 It was suggested to us that Policy P1/1 ought to make clear that the named locations for development are set out in an order of sequential preference, i.e. as a search sequence. Otherwise, it was argued, the policy did not fully comply with the guidance in RPG6 Policies 4 and 22 which expressly state that locations for housing and related development should be identified in a specific order of preference. RPG6 Policy 4 is intended to cover the East Anglian Region generally, with the exception of the Cambridge Sub-Region. The latter is covered in Policy 22 by a modified version of the PPG3 sequential approach which recognises the special circumstances which apply in the Cambridge area, including the high level of demand for housing, the limited capacity within the built-up area of Cambridge, the need for a review of the Green Belt and the case for a new settlement.
- 2.7 Policy P1/1 therefore seeks to integrate the two RPG approaches into an over-arching development policy for the Structure Plan area as a whole. The SPAs pointed out that the sequential approach in RPG6 had been followed in formulating both Policy P1/1 and the other policies in the Plan which set out in more detail the distribution of housing and other development. It is therefore unnecessary and inappropriate for the locational aspects of P1/1 to be expressed as a sequential order.
- 2.8 We agree with this. In practice it is inevitable that development will need to take place simultaneously at each of the general locations identified in P1/1 in order to achieve the required rates of development. This is recognised in paragraph 5.14 of RPG6. It would be difficult in the context of Local Plan preparation to apply a search sequence across different plan areas within the whole of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area and wrong for the Structure Plan to suggest this. In the interests of clarity we think it would be preferable for the opening sentence of the policy to refer to the great majority of land being 'located' rather than 'sought' in the named locations. This will convey more clearly that the locational framework has been set by the Structure Plan rather than suggesting that a search sequence still needs to be followed.
- 2.9 The SPAs also suggested during discussion of this topic that the supporting text could perhaps make clear that the strong RPG sequential approach has been applied in identifying the locations in Policy P1/1. Paragraph 1.15 already refers to RPG6 Policies 4 and 22 but we agree that strengthening this explanation would be helpful.

MARKET TOWNS

- 2.10 The Market Towns in Policy P1/1 are selected on the basis of a combination of their size (at or approaching a population of 15,000) and their function in providing services and facilities for their surrounding areas. No-one at the EIP seriously questioned the choice of Ely, Huntingdon, March, St. Ives, St. Neots and Wisbech, each of which clearly fulfills a Market Town function and where further development is sustainable. However, the identification and role of Chatteris, Ramsey and Whittlesey prompted some debate and questioning.
- 2.11 As indicated above, Ramsey and Whittlesey are identified for growth 'at a lesser scale' than the other Market Towns. The scale of growth at Chatteris is not qualified in the same way and its inclusion as a Market Town is justified (in paragraph 1.16) as a town well placed to provide a vital link - or stepping stone - between the Cambridge Sub-Region and other Fenland towns.

- 2.12 We discuss the role of these three settlements in more detail in Chapters 7 and 10. We have concluded that all three settlements should continue to qualify for Market Town status and that the reference to growth on a lesser scale at Whittlesey and Ramsey should be retained. We also question whether the size, location and role of Chatteris fully justifies identifying it for growth on a scale apparently equating it with the much larger Market Towns in Huntingdonshire, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire. However, on the basis that Chatteris is identified in Policy P9/6 as a priority for economic regeneration and that further housing allocations will be dependent on improving job prospects we have stopped short of recommending that it should qualify only for lesser growth like Ramsey and Whittlesey.
- 2.13 Turning to the detailed wording of the policy, the SPAs agreed with a suggestion from GO-East that the reference in the fourth bullet point to development ‘adjoining’ the Market Towns ought to be qualified in order to convey more forcibly the message of urban renaissance and the priority to development within towns and cities. Although the second set of locational criteria already make it clear that development on previously developed land and within existing settlements should be preferred over use of land outside settlements, we can see no harm in reinforcing the point. We therefore recommend amending the wording to *‘in, and where appropriate, adjoining the Market Towns’*.
- 2.14 We do not, however, consider that it is relevant to expand the definition of Huntingdon by adding a reference to Godmanchester, as suggested by one participant. Although Godmanchester and Huntingdon are closely related and, we understand, are conjoined for local planning purposes there is no necessity for this to be reflected in the Structure Plan. It is for Local Plans to define the extent of Market Towns and paragraph 1.16 of the supporting text already indicates that this can include adjoining settlements.

LOCATIONAL CRITERIA

- 2.15 The selection criteria in the second set of bullet points of Policy P1/1 are intended to guide the search sequence for development sites in Local Plans as well as the review of existing commitments and the assessment of new development proposals. The criteria apply to all the places identified in the first part of the policy. It was explained by the SPAs that the first three criteria set out a broad order of preference for site selection whilst the fourth criterion – which refers to development being located ‘where good public transport accessibility exists or can be provided’ – is intended to apply to all three previous locational criteria.
- 2.16 We accept that these criteria are intended to reflect the sequential approach to development set out in PPG3 (paragraphs 30-32) and RPG6 Policy 2. However, since there appeared to be some confusion and misunderstanding about the interpretation and application of the criteria we think that the supporting text ought to clarify how they are intended to be used and how they derive from PPG3 and RPG6. This could be done in the context of a general strengthening of the reference to the sequential approach in paragraph 1.15, as referred to above.
- 2.17 In addition, the criteria themselves should be clarified and strengthened to bring them more closely in line with PPG3 and RPG6. Based on suggestions made by participants and in part agreed by the SPAs at the EIP, we recommend that:

- the first bullet point should refer to *‘provision involving the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within existing settlements’* as having the highest priority (the reference to ‘sustainable locations’ is vague and unhelpful);
 - the second bullet point should qualify the preference for development within existing settlements by referring to the need to safeguard important open spaces;
 - the third bullet point should refer to the *‘re-use of previously developed land and buildings’*, in order to maintain consistency with the first bullet point;
 - the present fourth bullet point should appear as a separate paragraph so as to emphasise that its provision apply to all the development locations in the bullet points above. A reference to development being located so as to minimise the need to travel by car and encourage walking and cycling, as well as where good public transport accessibility exists or can be provided.
- 2.18 We do not regard it as important for Policy P1/1 to refer expressly to development on the periphery of settlements taking the form of ‘urban extensions’ or ‘plan-led mixed developments’ as suggested by some participants. The type of peripheral development will vary depending upon its scale and location in relation to the existing settlement. Policy P1/1 is concerned with the location not the type of development and not all peripheral development will take the form of major urban expansion. Other policies in the Structure Plan, notably Policy P1/3 ‘Sustainable Design in Built Development’, provide guidance on the mix of land uses, whilst policies dealing with the new settlement (P9/4) and major Green Belt releases (P9/3c) require masterplans or design briefs for major new developments. Nor do we consider that reference to development ‘close to’ urban areas as well as on the periphery of settlements would be appropriate. This would introduce an element of vagueness and uncertainty into the search sequence which runs counter to both PPG3 and RPG6.
- 2.19 It was also suggested that the present fourth bullet point ought to refer to development on ‘high quality public transport’ routes rather than simply locations ‘where good public transport’ accessibility exists or can be provided. The distinction between ‘high quality’ and ‘good’ public transport is dealt with in Policy P8/6 which we discuss in Chapter 6. Whilst the provision of high quality public transport is something which should be sought in relation to all major new developments, especially in the Cambridge Sub-Region, for the purposes of a general policy like P1/1 we consider that reference to good public transport is more appropriate and can, in this context, encompass both good services and high quality public transport as referred to in Policy P8/6.

RURAL CENTRES

- 2.20 During discussion at the EIP the SPAs proposed that the last paragraph of Policy P1/1, dealing with Rural Centres, should be relocated to sit below the first set of bullet points, which refer to the places where most land for new development will be located, and before the guidance on site selection criteria. We agree that this would be appropriate. Development in Rural Centres should obviously not be on a scale commensurate with that in the larger and more sustainable locations such as Cambridge, Peterborough, the new settlement and the Market Towns but it still has a role to play in the overall strategy. Moreover, the site selection criteria in the second set of bullet points, notably those relating to the use of previously developed land and buildings, should apply equally to the Rural Centres as to the larger locations. Relocating the paragraph will make this clear.

- 2.21 A number of participants suggested that this part of Policy P1/1 does not accord properly with RPG6 insofar as Policy 22 of the latter draws no distinction between the roles of Larger Villages and those of Market Towns and Previously Established New Settlements in meeting the housing needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region. It was suggested that the Structure Plan ought to adopt the same terminology as RPG6 and include 'larger villages' as a fifth bullet point in the list of locations for significant development. This would enable larger villages in sustainable locations close to Cambridge to play a part in meeting development requirements.
- 2.22 The Panel firmly rejects such a proposal. As indicated above, RPG6 Policy 22 covers the Cambridge Sub-Region but Policy 4 sets the order of site preference for development generally within the Region. This puts villages at the bottom of the development sequence and indicates that only 'exceptionally and on a small scale' should sites be identified in villages where there is a reasonable balance between jobs, services and housing and where there are frequent and convenient bus or rail services to a nearby town or city. It would be wrong, therefore, for Policy P1/1 to place Rural Centres (or Larger Villages) in a category where the great majority of land for new development is to be located. The relocation of the relevant paragraph, as indicated above, will partly meet the concerns of participants about the role of Rural Centres, whilst the reference to development in such locations being more limited will ensure that the policy complies with both regional and national policy guidance.
- 2.23 As for substituting 'Larger Villages' for 'Rural Centres' we regard it as a matter for the Structure Plan to use the terms and criteria which are appropriate to the character of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area. The Structure Plan does not need to stick slavishly to the wording of policies set out in RPG. However, things were not helped at the EIP by the SPAs describing Rural Centres as a 'sub-set' of the Larger Villages referred to in RPG6 Policy 22. Policy 22 does not seek to define Larger Villages but it seems to us that the criteria used in the Structure Plan to guide the selection of Rural Centres would embrace most large villages anyway. Moreover, if Rural Centres are only intended to be a sub-set of Larger Villages this begs the question of how the Structure Plan proposes to deal with settlements which count as Larger Villages but do not qualify as Rural Centres.
- 2.24 In practice, we regard such a distinction as unhelpful and largely irrelevant. It will be a matter for Local Plans to identify Rural Centres, using as a guide the criteria referred to in paragraph 1.17 of the Structure Plan. These indicate that Rural Centres will *'generally have a population of at least 3,000 and have good access to a secondary school, contain a primary school, food shops, post office, surgery and have good public transport services'*.
- 2.25 Some concern was expressed that these criteria were too inflexible and might inhibit the scope for development in smaller villages which need development in order to meet local economic and social needs. We do not think that this need be a worry. The criteria in paragraph 1.17 are not intended to be rigid requirements and will require interpretation and application in a Local Plan context. In relation to the size criterion, whilst we would expect most Rural Centres to have a population of at least 3,000, use of the term 'generally' in paragraph 1.17 signifies that there may be circumstances where villages of a slightly smaller size with a level of facilities serving a wider area might qualify for Rural Centre status. In the case of other small villages there are separate policies in the Structure Plan, notably P2/6, P3/4 and P5/5, designed to provide for small-scale development to support their vitality. We think that a cross reference to these policies in paragraph 1.18 of the supporting text would make this point clear.

- 2.26 It was suggested that the criteria ought to specify that Rural Centres should possess a secondary school rather than simply having good access to one. It was pointed out to us, however, that in some parts of the plan area there are villages which meet all or most of the criteria for Rural Centres but whose secondary school needs are met in a nearby settlement. We are satisfied therefore that the reference in paragraph 1.17 to Rural Centres having good access to a secondary school should be retained.
- 2.27 However, the criteria at present make no reference to jobs. It seems to us that any Rural Centres identified for even a limited scale of new development ought either to have an employment base of their own or be located so as to provide good accessibility to jobs in nearby cities or towns. In the case of the Cambridge Sub-Region in particular there are larger villages such as Melbourn which are important employment centres in their own right and where further development may be justified in order to enable businesses to grow and to maintain a reasonable balance between jobs and homes. We therefore recommend that the criteria in paragraph 1.17 should be expanded to refer to Rural Centres having good accessibility to employment.
- 2.28 It follows that the role of Rural Centres and the scale of development allocated to them will vary across the Plan area according to local circumstances. This is recognised in paragraph 1.17 of the Plan. In the Cambridge Sub-Region there is a high level of commitments in villages already built into the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. These have already been the subject of a sustainability review in the course of preparing the draft Structure Plan and we recommend in Chapter 7 that they should be subject to further review in the context of Policy P1/4 'Plan, Monitor and Manage' so as to ensure that development takes place in the most sustainable locations.
- 2.29 Nonetheless, it was made apparent during the EIP that in the short to medium term such commitments will be needed in order to contribute to meeting the enhanced housing needs of the Cambridge area, before the Green Belt releases and the new settlement come on stream. In order to reflect this position and also to convey that the role of Rural Centres will vary across the Plan area we recommend a modification to the wording of this part of Policy P1/1. Instead of referring to a 'limited scale of the overall development provision', which is in any event not entirely grammatical, we endorse a suggestion made at the EIP that this should read a '*limited proportion of the overall development provision*'. We also suggest adding the words '*on a scale appropriate to the size, location and function of such centres*' to the end of this clause and inserting the word '*especially*' before '*where it can make a contribution to the specified social and economic needs of those communities or to groups of communities*'. The revised wording is set out in full in the recommendations below.
- 2.30 We believe that these amendments will better reflect the realities of the situation in the Plan area, notably that some of the defined Rural Centres in the Cambridge Sub-Region will, in the early part of the Plan period, perform a dual role both as service centres for the surrounding area and in helping to meet the wider development needs of the Sub-Region. The precise proportion of development provision allocated to Rural Centres will be a matter to be determined by Local Plans and will obviously be greater in some areas than others.
- 2.31 It should be emphasised, however, that we do not intend this as a signal that larger villages around Cambridge should continue to play a significant role in meeting wider development needs once the existing commitments are used up. Throughout the EIP we heard reference to the need to 'turn the supertanker' of development provision in the Cambridge Sub-Region around to a more sustainable direction. We entirely endorse this,

whilst recognising that it will take time. The changes we recommend to Policy P1/1 are intended to reinforce the thrust of the main development strategy whilst reflecting the varying circumstances across the Plan area.

RECOMMENDATION 2A

Redraft Policy P1/1 – Approach to Development as follows:

‘The great majority of land for new development will be located:

- *within Cambridge and Peterborough consistent with the role and character of those cities;*
- *as expansion of Peterborough, and as expansion of Cambridge subject to changes to the Green Belt boundary;*
- *through the creation of a small town at Longstanton/Oakington close to Cambridge;*
- *in, and where appropriate adjoining, the Market Towns of Chatteris, Ely, Huntingdon, March, St. Ives, St. Neots, Wisbech and on a lesser scale Ramsey and Whittlesey.*

Local Plans may provide for a limited proportion of the overall development provision to take place at identified Rural Centres on a scale appropriate to the size, location and function of such centres, especially where it can make a contribution to the specified social and economic needs of those communities or to groups of communities.

When identifying sites for development in Local Plans at each of the above locations, or when reviewing commitments or assessing development proposals, Local Planning Authorities will apply the following selection criteria:

- *provision involving the use of previously developed land and buildings within existing settlements should be afforded the highest priority;*
- *provision within existing settlements should be preferred over the use of land outside settlements, subject to the need to safeguard important open spaces;*
- *on the periphery of settlements previously developed land and buildings should be preferred over the use of land that has not been developed previously;*

In all cases development should be located where travel distances by car can be minimised, walking and cycling encouraged and where good public transport accessibility exists or can be provided.’

Amend the supporting text as follows:

- Replace the second sentence in paragraph 1.15 with the following: *‘the strong sequential preference set out in RPG Policies 4 and 22 has influenced the choice of locations for development and the site selection criteria in Policy P1/1’;*
- add *‘and employment opportunities’* after *‘secondary school’* in paragraph 1.17;
- include at the end of the second sentence in paragraph 1.18 *‘(see Policies P2/6, P3/4 and P5/5)’*

CHAPTER 3

DELIVERABILITY OF THE STRATEGY

- 3.1 A major theme running through the debate at the EIP concerned the deliverability of the strategy. RPG6 sets an extremely challenging development target for the Plan area and particularly for the Cambridge Sub-Region. The scale of increase in houses and jobs must be accompanied by a commensurate improvement in infrastructure facilities. Infrastructure in this context means not only transport infrastructure and utilities but also a wide range of social and community facilities to service the increasing population, including affordable homes. In addition, the Structure Plan recognises that there is a significant infrastructure deficit to be made up, arising from insufficient levels of investment in relation to past rates of growth. The Roger Tym Study estimated the total potential cost at over £2,000 million pounds for the Cambridge Sub-Region¹.
- 3.2 The Plan seeks to reflect this in a suite of policies which emphasise the need for new developments to be accompanied by the provision of the requisite infrastructure and which recognise the importance of developer contributions towards such infrastructure.
- 3.3 Thus Policy P6/1 'Development-related Provision' states that: *'Development will only be permitted where the additional infrastructure and community requirements generated by the proposals can be secured, which may be by condition or legal agreement or undertaking. Local Plans should include appropriate policies and identify the infrastructure requirements in their site-specific policies'*. Policy P6/2 indicates that Regional and Local Strategic Partnerships will be the main vehicles for ensuring that developments with significant infrastructure implications are integrated with programmes for investment, service provision and community support.
- 3.4 In relation to the Cambridge Sub-Region, Policy P9/9 'Infrastructure Provision' seeks a comprehensive approach, through a joint partnership of stakeholders, to securing the infrastructure needed to support the development strategy for the Sub-Region. It sets out the components of a co-ordinated infrastructure programme to be delivered by the partnership and indicates that all development will be expected to make provision for infrastructure accommodating local impacts and also contributing to the needs of the Sub-Region as a whole.
- 3.5 In addition, there are references elsewhere in the Plan to the need for appropriate contributions from cluster businesses towards the provision of key worker housing and public transport (Policy P2/4), to new development being required to make provision for integrated and improved transport infrastructure through financial contributions and direct transport improvements (Policy P8/2) and to the use of Area Transport Plans as a means of identifying transport contributions that will need to be made by developers (Policy P8/3). We deal with these policies in the appropriate chapters on Housing (Chapter 5) and Transport (Chapter 6).
- 3.6 A number of issues arose during the EIP in relation to the two key policies concerned with development-related provision, namely Policies P6/1 and P9/9. We deal with these below under the following headings:
 - identification of infrastructure requirements;

¹ Implementing the Cambridge Sub-Regional Study, Roger Tym and Partners, October 2001 (CD2.5)

- the range and type of development that ought to contribute towards infrastructure investment;
- delivery mechanisms, including the proposed ‘pooling’ arrangements for developer contributions in the Cambridge Sub-Region.

3.7 Other important themes concerned with the deliverability of the strategy, including the feasibility of meeting the housing targets, the need to speed up the planning process and the timescale for delivering major development proposals such as the new settlement are dealt with elsewhere in the Report, notably in Chapters 5, 8 and 9.

IDENTIFICATION OF INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS

3.8 In support of Policy P6/1 the Structure Plan sets out, in paragraph 6.1 of the explanatory text, a long list of community facilities, utilities and transport infrastructure, towards which new development will be expected to contribute. Similarly, Policy P9/9 contains within the body of the policy itself an indication of the broad types of infrastructure which will be encompassed within the co-ordinated programme to be delivered by the Stakeholder Partnership in the Cambridge Sub-Region.

3.9 It was suggested by some participants that this did not go far enough and that the Structure Plan ought to identify in more detail the specific strategic infrastructure requirements to be funded and their costs. It was put to us that any requirements which were clearly strategic and which had implications across local authority boundaries would fall into this category; non-strategic infrastructure need not be specified.

3.10 We see considerable difficulties with such an approach. Firstly, it would be quite difficult to draw a distinction between strategic and non-strategic elements of infrastructure, even using the ‘cross-boundary’ criterion suggested. Some items of infrastructure are obviously strategic, such as the proposed Rapid Transit System. Others are not so obvious such as libraries, local community and health facilities and the like. Some participants even argued that affordable housing was a local rather than a strategic matter.

3.11 Secondly, whilst some of the strategic infrastructure requirements and their broad costs are known, such as those arising from the Cambridge-Huntingdon Multi-Modal Study (CHUMMS) proposals, others are not. The SPAs foresaw that one effect of such an approach might be to ring-fence developer contributions towards specific items. This might hamstring the role of the Strategic Partnerships, which were still coming together and which would need the ability to change and adapt the programme of investment in relation to changing circumstances.

3.12 We agree with the SPAs. Whilst we understand the wish for greater certainty over the delivery of infrastructure and the strength this might afford to District Councils in negotiating adequate developer contributions, we do not think it is the place of the Structure Plan policies to go into so much detail. Indeed this might be a hostage to fortune if any key elements of infrastructure were missed out or if infrastructure requirements and their costs were to change.

3.13 In our view, Policies P6/1 and P9/9 properly set the framework for the identification of infrastructure requirements and contain as much detail as is necessary and reasonable to provide a context for Local Plans and for taking forward the programme of development and infrastructure by the Stakeholder Partnership in the Cambridge Sub-Region.

However, in order partly to meet the points made by participants, in Chapter 6 we have endorsed the SPAs' suggestion that tables setting out the indicative phasing of development in relation to major transport infrastructure should be included in Chapters 9 and 10 (as set out in SPA Supplement 31). Similarly, the text to P9/9 could refer specifically to the costs contained in the Roger Tym report (para. 40) as an illustration of the scale of potential investment likely to be required to implement the Cambridge Sub-Region Strategy. At present the only reference in the Plan to this study is in paragraph 6.6 yet it was widely quoted during the EIP as the main source of information on infrastructure costs and developer contributions.

- 3.14 During the EIP we were also presented with a great deal of additional information setting out progress on the Cambridge Sub-Region Strategy and the phasing of key infrastructure in relation to the programme of development.² We envisage that this is the kind of detailed information which the Stakeholder Partnership will use for implementing and monitoring the Strategy and for identifying developer contributions towards specific infrastructure investment.
- 3.15 Some LPAs and GO-East expressed concern about Policy P6/1 (when read with paragraph 6.4) implying that Local Plan policies should identify all the infrastructure requirements in their site-specific policies. The SPAs agreed that this was unduly onerous and proposed substitution of the words '*key infrastructure requirements*' instead. We agree that this would be appropriate. We also note the suggestion by one participant that the Plan should make clear that infrastructure should refer to service improvements as well as to capital investment. This would accord with the advice in paragraph B10 of Circular 1/97. It might be helpful if this was clarified in the supporting text to Policy P6/1.
- 3.16 Turning to the detailed lists of infrastructure requirements contained in paragraph 6.1 and Policy P9/9 of the Plan, it was pointed out that there was some inconsistency between the two. Policy P9/9 recognises environmental improvements as part of the infrastructure required in the Cambridge Sub-Region whereas the list in paragraph 6.1 does not mention environmental improvements but refers to open space. Whilst this is a minor issue there is clearly some merit in maintaining consistency between the two policies so as to avoid any misunderstanding. We therefore recommend that this discrepancy should be corrected, by referring to the provision of open space in Policy P9/9 and environmental improvements in paragraph 6.1.
- 3.17 A specific issue was raised in this context by the National Trust, concerning the use of developer contributions to fund the expansion of their Wicken Fen project. We regard this as a good example of a matter to be negotiated via the Stakeholder Partnership. Decisions on the extent to which specific proposals can qualify as necessary sub-regional infrastructure associated with the scale of development in and around Cambridge are best determined by the Partnership on the basis of applying consistent criteria. This is a good reason for not including too much detail in the Structure Plan itself.

² SPA Supplement 2 'Phasing and Delivery of Transport Infrastructure in Relation to the proposed New Settlement at Longstanton/Oakington' and SPA Supplement 17 'Cambridge Sub-Region – Progress towards Implementation.'

RANGE AND TYPE OF QUALIFYING DEVELOPMENT

- 3.18 At present, Policy P9/9 indicates that all development (our underlining) is expected to contribute towards the infrastructure needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region as a whole, as well as making provision for any immediate local impact. This approach towards the ‘pooling’ of developer contributions in order to help fund major elements of sub-regional infrastructure is regarded by the SPAs and others as fundamental to ensuring that development is accompanied by adequate infrastructure provision.
- 3.19 However, the concept did attract criticism from some quarters. Addenbrooke’s NHS Trust, for example, suggested that it was somewhat ambiguous for the policy to specify health facilities as part of the infrastructure required in association with new development yet to imply that their proposals for major hospital expansion should provide contributions towards meeting sub-regional infrastructure needs. Similarly, the University of Cambridge argued that as a not-for-profit organisation its development in North West Cambridge should not be liable for the level of infrastructure charges expected from commercial developers.
- 3.20 It was suggested that concerns like these could be met simply by deleting the reference in the policy to ‘all’ development having to contribute to infrastructure requirements or by making it clear that only ‘commercial’ development should contribute. Others, however, argued that, given the scale of infrastructure required over the Plan period, it was only right and equitable for all developments which were major generators of traffic or housing demand to contribute towards mitigating their impact on travel or assisting with housing key workers. Deletion of the word ‘all’ would potentially let too many developments off; any special pleading for exemptions should be handled on a case by case basis by the Stakeholder Partnership.
- 3.21 The Panel agrees that, in principle, all development having a significant impact on infrastructure needs should be taken into account in determining contributions towards new infrastructure. We have some sympathy with the position of Addenbrooke’s, insofar as the need for expansion of the hospital is largely a function of the growth of population associated with the pace of development in the Sub-Region. On the other hand, some elements of the South Cambridge development are of a commercial nature which should clearly contribute to meeting infrastructure requirements. Similarly we note that both the Addenbrooke’s and University expansions will incorporate some on-site housing designed to meet the needs of key workers. This should be taken into account in determining whether and to what extent these developments should contribute towards the ‘pooling’ arrangements.
- 3.22 The SPAs pointed out that both Addenbrooke’s and the University are potential future members of the Stakeholder Partnership. Among the key factors in determining their position would be the impact of their developments, the uplift in value and the extent to which their developments were directly providing a service to the Sub-Region. All these were matters best determined in the context of the Partnership itself and required no amendment to the policies.
- 3.23 Whilst we support this general approach we question whether the reference to ‘all’ development being expected to contribute to the needs of the Sub-Region is reasonable and practicable. Taken literally it would mean that even minor householder planning applications would fall within the ambit of the policy and would require the completion of a planning agreement before permission was given. This is clearly not the intention and

we think that this wording needs to be qualified to reflect this, without opening the way to exempting too much development and thus undermining the overall purpose.

- 3.24 Since the general intention is to capture all development likely to impose demands on infrastructure we suggest amending the wording to '*All development likely to have a definable impact on infrastructure requirements...*'. In determining contributions to the wider needs of the Sub-Region we also suggest that reference to these being '*on a transparent and equitable basis*' would convey the intent of the approach and give some comfort to those who have expressed concern about this part of the policy. In relation to any particular development it will then be a matter for the Partnership to decide what scale of development constitutes a definable impact and to seek the appropriate level of contribution according to a clear set of criteria.
- 3.25 Some participants also expressed concern that future developments may be expected not only to fund infrastructure arising from new development but also to meet the deficit arising from previous under-investment. Our attention was drawn to paragraph B12 of Circular 1/97 'Planning Obligations' which states that '*Developers should not be expected to pay for facilities which are needed solely in order to resolve existing deficiencies nor should attempts be made to extract excessive contributions to infrastructure costs from developers*'.
- 3.26 We would anticipate some difficulties in distinguishing to what extent the programme of major infrastructure required in order to facilitate the scale of future development will also serve to meet past deficits. Moreover, Circular 1/97 goes on to indicate that obligations may be sought to '*overcome an existing constraint which is materially exacerbated by a proposal*' and that situations may arise where '*it would clearly be inappropriate to grant planning permission for a development which would exacerbate a situation which is already unsatisfactory*'. In the Cambridge Sub-Region it is clear that this situation applies fairly widely.
- 3.27 In practice, as indicated above, we would anticipate the Stakeholder Partnership determining the programme of investment required, the types of development qualifying for developer contributions and the basis for determining the level of contribution. Consequently, we do not think it would be necessary – or desirable – to seek amendments to the Structure Plan policies to meet the concerns expressed.
- 3.28 However, the SPAs did suggest that there may be a case for developing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on the approach to obtaining funding from developer contributions. We agree that this would help to demonstrate that the approach is being applied on a consistent and equitable basis. Although the SPAs suggested this in the context of Policy P6/1 we think that the need for SPG is more obvious in connection with P9/9 where the sub-regional approach to developer contributions applies (see below). Accordingly, we recommend that a reference to such guidance should be incorporated into Policy P9/9, with further explanation in the supporting text.

DELIVERY MECHANISMS

Stakeholder Partnership

- 3.29 It is evident from everything we heard during the EIP that delivery of the Cambridge Sub-Region Strategy rests heavily on the early establishment and success of the proposed

Stakeholder Partnership. Since the publication of the Structure Plan events have moved on apace in establishing the Partnership. During the EIP we were presented with further information on progress (SPA Supplement 17).

- 3.30 A Strategic Partnership has been established involving Leaders and Chief Executives from the County and District Councils, with representation from GO-East, the Greater Cambridge Partnership (representing the private sector) and EEDA. This group is intended to provide a strategic overview and establish an approach to developing and expanding the partnership to encompass a wider range of stakeholders. A dedicated core implementation team has been established within the County Council to co-ordinate the delivery process. Joint working groups are examining different aspects of the strategy's implementation, including:
- accelerating the planning process;
 - transport implementation and PFI;
 - a housing strategy and a sub-region affordable housing delivery plan;
 - a strategic approach to Section 106 planning obligations;
 - sustainable communities – the design and build of new developments.
- 3.31 This represents, in our view, clear and impressive evidence of intent on the part of the County Council and other partners to make progress and a convincing response to those at the EIP who expressed doubts about the deliverability of the Strategy through the Partnership approach.
- 3.32 On a point of detail it is evident that the reference in paragraph 9.48 of the Structure Plan to a more co-ordinated approach to infrastructure provision and developer funding being *'likely to require the creation of a Stakeholder Partnership'* is now out-dated and needs to be amended to reflect recent progress.

Section 106 contributions

- 3.33 An important aspect of deliverability which prompted considerable debate is whether the 'pooling' arrangements for Section 106 contributions can be made to work. The Roger Tym study estimated that some £550 million might be raised from this source, together with £180 million of free land for affordable housing.
- 3.34 Some participants suggested that the proposals set out in Policy P9/9 would be likely to fall foul of present government guidance on planning obligations in Circular 1/97. Paragraph B17 of the Circular indicates that development plan policies likely to be unacceptable to the Secretary of State are those which:
- seek benefits not directly related to the proposed development;
 - are based on a blanket formulation;
 - seek contributions to a general fund to be used to finance a number of facilities or a specific facility unless such facilities are directly related to the development proposed.
- 3.35 The Government is planning to issue new guidance on how Section 106 planning obligations should work, having decided to abandon the tariff approach floated in the

earlier consultation paper on ‘Reforming Planning Obligations’ (Dec 2000). We understand that the intention is to produce a system which delivers five objectives:

- enabling communities to share in the benefits arising from developments
- speed
- transparency
- predictability
- propriety

The SPAs indicated that they were looking to any new system to provide the flexibility which would enable the pooling of Section 106 contributions to operate across the Cambridge Sub-Region. The Panel recognise that the removal of any doubt about the legitimacy of the pooling arrangements would be a significant step forward in the successful implementation of the Sub-Regional Strategy.

- 3.36 This is not to say that the system is necessarily unworkable without changes to Circular 1/97. It was pointed out to us that the approach to developer contributions contained within the Plan builds on a long established system operating within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. For more than 10 years, the County and District Councils have been working together negotiating with developers on contributions to enable provision of facilities and services necessitated by new development. For example, Cambridge City Council and the County Council have implemented, through Supplementary Planning Guidance, a system of developer contributions to fund transport infrastructure investment across two of the quadrants of the City and consideration is being given to extending this approach to a third quadrant (see Chapter 6).
- 3.37 The Roger Tym study (paragraphs 5.35–5.40) advances a strong argument to justify a standard strategic approach towards developer contributions for the Sub-Region. This is based on the clear imperative set out in RPG6 to deliver within a fixed time period housing and jobs for a greatly expanded population (100,000), the compelling requirement to provide infrastructure throughout the Sub-Region to support this growth and thus, in terms of Circular 1/97, a demonstration of a necessary, relevant and direct connection between infrastructure provision and every development site within the area. This in turn constitutes, in their view, a necessary and relevant planning reason to formulate Section 106 Agreements on a sub-regional basis. Such an approach also has clear benefits in terms of equity, transparency, speed of operation and cost savings.
- 3.38 GO-East indicated at the EIP that they did not consider that it was inappropriate to use planning obligations to meet sub-regional needs provided that the sub-regional infrastructure for which the contribution is sought can be related to the development in question and that the other tests of Circular 1/97 are met. Ultimately, whether the Roger Tym approach is acceptable within the terms of the present Circular is something which could only be tested if there were a specific challenge through the courts. However, if Circular 1/97 were amended to clarify the extent to which Section 106 Agreements can be more widely applied, for instance where a clear planning reason has been established in regional planning guidance, then any such risk would be averted.
- 3.39 So far as the Panel is concerned, we can see no reason to amend the Structure Plan’s policies to reflect any doubts about compatibility with Circular 1/97. We have already suggested some changes to clarify and strengthen Policy P9/9 and the supporting text and

we endorse the SPAs' proposal to introduce Supplementary Planning Guidance in order to set out in more detail how the approach to seeking developer contributions will work.

Other sources of funding

- 3.40 Turning to wider issues of deliverability, it was pointed out that Section 106 contributions, although important, accounted for only a part of the total potential costs estimated in the Roger Tym Study, i.e. £730 million out of a total of over £2,000 million needed in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Other sources of finance include: private finance initiatives (PFI) and/or mainstream funding for strategic transport and NHS infrastructure; Local Transport Plan funding; resources from the Housing Corporation for affordable housing; and direct funding of water, sewerage and telecommunications infrastructure from utilities companies. It was impressed upon us that the Government has an important role to play in ensuring that much of this funding is delivered and that without a clear commitment from Government the Strategy is vulnerable.
- 3.41 A vital component of infrastructure reliant upon Government support is implementation of the CHUMMS proposals, including the Rapid Transit System to serve the new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington. We discuss this in more detail in Chapters 6 and 9. We take the view that the Transport Minister's endorsement of the CHUMMS Preferred Plan³ constitutes a clear commitment by Government to implement the proposals, without pre-empting any of the usual statutory and other processes through which transport projects have to be developed. A joint statement to the EIP by Cambridgeshire County Council, GO-East and the Highways Agency on the delivery of transport infrastructure in relation to the proposed new settlement reinforces this position and indicates that work has been progressing on the major elements of the CHUMMS Plan.
- 3.42 Other elements of Government funding such as support for the Local Transport Plan and for social housing via the Housing Corporation are determined through the usual resource allocation processes on an annual/3 year cycle. Obviously no absolute guarantees can be given that the level of funding indicated by the Roger Tym study will be forthcoming. However, the Panel have been impressed by the degree of co-operation and joint working by all stakeholders, including Government, in taking forward the Sub-Region Strategy so far. We recognise the importance of the Government's continued commitment and we trust that having set a clear framework for future development in RPG6, Government will fulfil its part of the bargain in delivering the funding on which the Strategy so clearly depends. If the requisite infrastructure were, for whatever reason, not forthcoming to meet the scale and pace of development needed then the Strategy itself would need to be reviewed.

RECOMMENDATION 3A

Amend the second paragraph of Policy P6/1 by the insertion of 'key' before 'infrastructure requirements.'

Amend paragraph 6.1 to include reference to 'environmental improvements'.

Amend the last sentence of paragraph 6.4 in the supporting text to refer to:

³ Letter from John Spellar MP, Minister for Transport to East of England. Local Government Conference, 13 December 2001.

‘key site-specific infrastructure requirements.’ Add after this ‘Infrastructure in this context means both capital projects and/or service improvements’

RECOMMENDATION 3B

Add ‘and provision of open space’ to 6th bullet point of Policy P9/9 and amend final paragraph to read:

‘All development likely to have a definable impact on infrastructure requirements will be expected to make provision for infrastructure accommodating local impacts and also contributing to the needs of the Sub-Region as a whole. This provision is to be delivered through the joint partnership mechanism on the basis of Supplementary Planning Guidance which will set out a transparent and equitable method for the collection of contributions towards the Sub-Region infrastructure requirements. Local Plans will indicate major infrastructure requirements and any implications for the phasing of development. A commitment to the provision of associated infrastructure will be required before development is permitted.’

Delete the second sentence of paragraph 9.48 and insert an up-dated position statement on the role of the Stakeholder Partnership in delivering programmes of infrastructure. Explain the process by which this will be done i.e. using Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Include a reference in Chapter 9.49 to the indicative costs and funding of infrastructure set out in paragraph 40 of the Roger Tym study.

CHAPTER 4

EMPLOYMENT

- 4.1 The employment chapter of the Plan follows on from, and takes forward, the Sustainable Development Strategy in Chapter 1. There are six policies in total which set out the proposals for the economic growth and development across the Structure Plan area. These cover:
- the strategy (Policy P2/1);
 - general location of employment development (Policy P2/2);
 - strategic employment locations (SELs) (Policy P2/3);
 - employment clusters (Policy P2/4);
 - distribution, warehousing and manufacturing (Policy P2/5);
 - the rural economy (Policy P2/6).
- 4.2 Two further policies are directly relevant to the employment chapter in the Plan. These are:
- P9/8: Selective Management of Employment Locations – this policy defines the types of employment development suitable for land in and close to Cambridge. We deal with this policy in Chapter 7 which addresses the strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region.
 - P9/4: New Settlement – this policy briefly sets out the proposed employment uses at the new settlement. We deal with this in Chapter 9.
- 4.3 The key issues arising from the debate at the EIP are :
- whether the Structure Plan provides appropriate guidance on the quantum, general location of, and strategy for, employment development;
 - whether the Strategic Employment Locations selected are the most appropriate;
 - whether the Plan contains a suitable approach to employment clusters.
- 4.4 In Chapter 11 we also discuss changes which the SPAs propose in response to a concern about the extent to which the Plan addresses the economic and social needs of rural areas (SPA Supplement 26). We support these changes and make the consequential recommendations to Policies P2/1 and P2/2 and their supporting text under the relevant policies below.

QUANTUM

- 4.5 There was some confusion amongst participants as to whether or not there was a need for additional employment land within the Plan area beyond that which is already committed (i.e. planning permissions and local plan allocations). This arises because of the apparent discrepancy between the first sentence in paragraph 2.19 of the Plan and the proposed employment land provision in SPA Supplement 4. Paragraph 2.19 states that *‘While there is currently enough employment land to cater for projected growth it is important to create the right conditions in which business can thrive and prosper’*. This would suggest

that there is no need to allocate further employment land in the Plan area. However, SPA Supplement 4 indicates that there is a small shortfall of employment land beyond that which is committed, based on an increase in the estimated take-up of land over the Plan period. All six LPAs are expected to show an increase in the take-up rates of employment land.

- 4.6 Moreover, Table 5.2 of the Technical Report Supplement¹ shows that at March 2002 the total potential jobs on land with ‘Planning permissions and local plan allocations’ was 78,100. ‘Other recognised sites’ and ‘Other strategic proposals’ contribute a further 9,100 and 9,200 potential jobs respectively, thus producing a total of 96,400 potential jobs. This would exceed, by about 30,000, the forecast for job growth for the period between 2001 and 2016, which is estimated at 63,750 (Table 2.1 of the Structure Plan). Such figures, of course, need to be treated with some caution, not least because any long term projections of labour demand can be subject to wide margins of error, whilst estimates of the job capacity on employment land are heavily dependent upon accuracy of assumptions about employment densities. Moreover, not all projected increases in jobs will be reliant on new employment land allocations – such as those in sectors like retailing, education, health care and self-employment
- 4.7 This analysis would suggest that there is no need to allocate further land above that which is already committed in order to meet the projected employment needs. Indeed, we heard from a number of participants who were concerned that additional employment will exacerbate the existing jobs/housing imbalance. It was contended that, as there is a pressing need for housing in order to meet the employment needs of the Plan area - notably in the Cambridge Sub-Region - additional employment land will merely add pressure to the over-heating housing market. Whilst we understand these concerns there are a number of other factors to take into account.
- 4.8 Firstly, whilst we recognise that there is a pressing need for housing, the Cambridge Sub-Region is also an extremely important centre for the economic growth of the region. Indeed, the Sub-Region was described as the engine room of the regional economy. There is a danger that not providing further suitable employment land in appropriate locations could stifle economic development.
- 4.9 Secondly, there has been a major shift in the overall development strategy for the Plan area, which now focusses a greater proportion of development in and around the major urban areas. The majority of the 18,300 potential jobs in the ‘Other recognised sites’ and ‘Other strategic proposals’ categories are to be delivered at the major employment locations in the Cambridge Sub-Region which are closely associated with areas of housing development. We consider the suitability of the identified locations below but, in principle, the strategic locations are needed to push forward the ‘Cambridge Phenomenon’ and to meet the general needs of new communities in a sustainable manner, notably in relation to locations on the edge of the city.
- 4.10 Thirdly, it is not necessarily the case that all the employment land in Table 5.2 of the Technical Report Supplement will come forward within the Plan period. Following the review of existing commitments there may be allocated sites which are not continued through into local plan reviews, and there are likely to be sites with planning permissions which lapse and are not renewed.

¹ Page 25 (CD1.3.1)

- 4.11 Finally, given that there is existing committed land available, it is likely that much of the additional employment growth will take place towards the end of, if not beyond, the Plan period. This is particularly the case for the University which has a large amount of committed employment land already available at their Western Campus to meet their expansion needs. There is an opportunity, therefore, to meet the pressing housing needs in the short term without harming the medium to long term momentum of the ‘Cambridge Phenomenon’.
- 4.12 These factors indicate that there is a wider context to the need for employment growth in the Sub-Region, beyond the purely statistical employment forecasts. Accordingly, we are satisfied that the allocation of further land for employment as set out in SPA Supplement 4:
- will not be contrary to the general development strategy;
 - will not stand in the way of meeting the pressing need for housing; and
 - will help to provide the best employment to housing balance for the Plan area in the long term.
- 4.13 In terms of whether the Plan should contain more guidance on the amount of land required, we agree that some indication of the expected employment land requirement in each LPA area would provide greater certainty and would be helpful to the LPAs in the preparation of their Local P covered plans or successor documents. As to the exact split, we believe that the table in SPA Supplement 4 provides an appropriate breakdown between the LPA areas. On a broad strategic level, it appears to include a reasonable balance between retaining a proportion of the existing commitments, providing for continued economic growth and re-orientating the employment locations in line with the general development strategy. However, this table is merely an indicative allocation of the strategic employment requirement, which will need to be tested through the local plan process. Accordingly, the table should be included in the supporting text rather than in the policy, together with a caveat about its status. The appropriate location for this table is in relation to Policy P2/2.

RECOMMENDATION 4A

Include in the supporting text to Policy P2/2 details of the allocation of employment land between the LPAs, as set out in the revised SPA Supplement 4, with the caveat that these figures are indicative only.

GENERAL LOCATION AND STRATEGY (Policies P2/1 and P2/2)

- 4.14 Policy P2/1 establishes a very broad strategy for employment growth, distinguishing between the approach to be followed in the Cambridge Sub-Region and in the Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area. Policy P2/2 sets out the general strategy for the location of employment development, including a list of six locational criteria based on the objectives of Policy P1/1.

Policy P2/1

- 4.15 In relation to Policy P2/1 it was contended that there is an internal inconsistency between the final bullet point under the Cambridge Sub-Region section and the first bullet point under the section covering both areas. The former states that there will be a policy of selective management in the Cambridge area, whilst the latter seeks to encourage a wider range of business and industrial development throughout the Plan area. We do not believe that there is any fundamental inconsistency between these two points. Whilst future employment development in the immediate Cambridge area is to be controlled by the application of the selective management approach in Policy P9/8, there is some flexibility for a greater diversity and range of business and industrial development as set out in sub paragraph b) of that policy. In the rest of the Sub-Region a less restrictive approach to employment development is adopted. Thus, Policy P2/1 read together with Policy P9/8 provides a consistent approach to employment development in the Cambridge Sub-Region as a whole.
- 4.16 Our recommendations below, as indicated earlier, are drawn from Chapter 11 and seek to recognise the role of economic development in rural areas (see paragraph 4.4 above).

RECOMMENDATION 4B

Amend Policy P2/1 by adding a third bullet point under ‘in both areas’ as follows:

‘• Enabling the diversification of the rural economy (see Policy P2/6).’

Insert a new final sentence into paragraph 2.17 to read:

‘Diversification will maximise opportunities to maintain incomes and employment in rural areas’.

Policy P2/2

- 4.17 Policy P2/2 sets out the general approach to the location of employment development. Four issues arise in relation to this policy. Firstly, it was contended that the policy did not adequately address the employment needs of rural areas. In Chapter 11 we have endorsed changes to this policy proposed by the SPAs which will meet this point. These involve the insertion of a reference to rural centres in the opening paragraph and the addition of a further bullet point referring to support for rural services and facilities.
- 4.18 The second issue relates to the second criterion in the policy, concerned with maintaining a range of types and sizes of premises for business requirements. EEDA recommended that this criterion be replaced with the words *‘provide and monitor a range of sub regional and strategic sites and premises in locations that meet the demands of business’*. In our opinion, the revised wording would not substantially add to what is already provided by the existing criterion.
- 4.19 Thirdly, it was suggested that the Plan should include an express requirement for LPAs to review existing allocations. This was generally accepted by the participants and a form of words was put forward by the SPAs. We agree that this would be a positive addition to the Plan and would complement the guidance in paragraph 42 of PPG3 on reviewing existing employment allocations.

- 4.20 Finally, it was suggested that the Plan should include a requirement for LPAs to allocate smaller employment sites in line with the sequential approach. All developments, including small-scale employment allocations must be identified in accordance with the criteria for development outlined in Policy P1/1, which embraces the sequential approach in RPG6. In our opinion, a specific reference to the sequential approach is not necessary.
- 4.21 Our recommendations include changes to Policy P2/2 and paragraph 2.21 drawn from our conclusions in Chapter 11 (see paragraph 4.4 above).

RECOMMENDATION 4C

Amend Policy P2/2 as follows:

- insert *'and in rural centres'* after *'in market towns'* in the first sentence;
- include the words *'review existing employment allocations and'* after *'Local Plans will'* at the beginning of the second paragraph;
- add under the list of points (i)-(vi) *'(vii) support rural services and facilities (see Policy P3/4)'*.

Delete the first sentence of paragraph 2.19 and replace with:

'While there is currently enough employment land to cater for the projected growth, additional strategic employment land is proposed in order to maintain the momentum of the 'Cambridge Phenomenon'.'

Insert *'and rural centres'* after *'market towns'* into the second sentence of paragraph 2.21.

STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT LOCATIONS (SELs) (Policy P2/3)

- 4.22 Policy P2/3 identifies eight SELs within the Plan area. We heard a number of arguments both supporting and opposing the identification of these locations. Some participants, including the SPAs, also suggested the addition of further SELs to the policy.
- 4.23 In order to clarify the basis on which the SELs had been identified and whether they represent the most appropriate locations, the SPAs produced an appraisal of the SELs against the criteria in Policies P1/1 and P2/2 (SPA Supplement 5). While this seeks to justify the allocations in the Plan it does not set out why these locations were chosen in the first instance. Nevertheless, this table provides a useful guide as to which factors were considered.
- 4.24 Our deliberations in this section are twofold:
- firstly, we assess the suitability of the identified SELs where these have been questioned by the participants; and
 - secondly, we consider whether certain alternative locations proposed by participants would be suitable, either in addition to, or in substitution for, the identified SELs.

Suitability of the identified SELs

- 4.25 Alconbury Airfield is the first of the SELs identified in the policy and was the subject of some debate at the EIP. It comprises a large redundant United States Air Force airbase to the north west of Cambridge. There is considerable uncertainty over the future of the Airfield as the site is the subject of an extant planning appeal, currently in the hands of the First Secretary of State. This uncertainty is addressed in paragraph 2.23 of the Plan, which simply indicates that Alconbury provides a major strategic opportunity for a mixed employment development, outlines briefly the uses proposed for the site in the current planning application and sets out the approach to be followed if the appeal is dismissed. In our view, the Plan as currently worded does not seek to pre-empt the decision of the Secretary of State. It merely outlines the situation at the time the Plan was published. In light of the current circumstances, we consider this approach to be eminently sensible.
- 4.26 Turning to whether Alconbury should be identified as a SEL, as we see it SELs stand apart from other local employment allocations, not necessarily due to their scale but because of the nature and importance of their location strategically. The proposals for Alconbury currently before the Secretary of State are clearly of a strategic nature as they have implications, particularly in terms of transport infrastructure, which transcend LPA areas. Moreover, the approach to Alconbury in this Plan is a continuation of Policy SP16/4 in the current Structure Plan. At this stage, we see no reason to depart from this policy framework pending the outcome of the appeal. If a decision is reached before the modifications to the Structure Plan are published the SPAs will no doubt wish to review their position.
- 4.27 Two participants raised concerns over the SEL allocation at the proposed new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington. These concerns did not relate to the principle of the allocation or the wording of the policy, but to the restriction in paragraph 2.24 on the types of businesses deemed appropriate at this location. While the approach in this paragraph is similar to Policy P9/8 on the selective management of employment development, it goes further and, effectively, implies that there is intended to be a blanket restriction on employment development which does not need to be located in the Cambridge Sub-Region. That approach does not accord with Policy P9/8; neither does it properly reflect what is said in Policy P9/4. Minor revisions to the text which we recommend below will overcome this problem.
- 4.28 Replacement wording was suggested for paragraph 2.25 in relation to the Hampton Township. This would recognise that, in order to deliver an effective mixed use development, a flexible approach to the safeguarding and allocation of areas of employment land will be encouraged. We note that Policy P10/5, which deals expressly with Hampton, refers to *'the promotion of mixed-use development'* as one of the principles to be incorporated into a new Masterplan. In our view, this should ensure that mixed use development is given an appropriate focus in the future planning of the township and there is no need for any change to paragraph 2.25.
- 4.29 A number of participants suggested that the SELs on the edge of Cambridge, as defined in paragraph 2.27, should be included in the policy. In response, the SPAs provided revised wording for both the policy and supporting text (SPA Supplement 19). There is no difference between the status of the locations in paragraph 2.27 and those included in the policy. Accordingly, with one minor amendment to clarify that south and west of Addenbrooke's Hospital is one rather than two separate locations, we recommend that this revised wording be included in the Plan.

Other proposed SELs

4.30 Four additional SELs were proposed by participants at the EIP. These are:

- The Genome Campus at Hinxton;
- The Babraham Institute;
- Bourn Airfield;
- Chatteris.

4.31 Each of these locations is within the Cambridge Sub-Region so the guidance in Policy 23 of RPG6 applies. This states that *'Employment generating development should be located in locations where good public transport, cycling and walking access exists or can be provided:*

- *within or by extensions to the built-up area of Cambridge;*
- *in the new settlement close to Cambridge;*
- *within or by extension to Market Towns.'*

We consider each of the above locations in turn:

Genome Campus and Babraham Institute

4.32 The Genome Campus and Babraham Institute are very similar in many respects, not least because of their location in the rural area to the south of Cambridge. We therefore deal with these two locations together.

4.33 We recognise and acknowledge that both locations are extremely valuable assets and foci for the growth of the 'Cambridge Phenomenon'. However, neither location is particularly sustainable, nor are they well related to the majority of the new strategic housing allocations. Therefore, they are not appropriate to be identified as SELs, which would imply future major growth involving significant diversification of use. The fact that these locations are not identified as SELs does not mean that no further growth should be permitted at either location. Indeed, it would be contrary to the economic strategy of the Region to restrict the continued development of these employment locations where such development is related to the nature of the work being undertaken on site. Whilst we do not support their identification as SELs in Policy P2/3, given the importance of these employment sites we believe that there should be some recognition in the Plan of their contribution to the economy. In this respect, we endorse the inclusion of some additional text to support Policy P9/7 which was suggested by the SPAs (in SPA Supplement 18)².

Bourn Airfield

4.34 This location lies on the A428 to the west of Cambridge. It is some distance from both the built-up area of Cambridge and the proposed new strategic housing locations. However, unlike these other two locations, Bourn Airfield is not a major existing employment centre.

4.35 Bourn Airfield was promoted partly because of its close proximity to the new settlement at Cambourne. Cambourne was granted planning permission under the strategy of dispersal advocated in the current Structure Plan. Later in this report we conclude that

² See the recommendations following Policy P9/8 in Chapter 7.

there may be a case for further development to make Cambourne a more sustainable community (see Chapter 9). In that eventuality, the identification of Bourn Airfield as an employment location may be justified as part of any further development. A critical consideration will be improvement in accessibility, especially by public transport. At this stage, we do not think that a case has been made for the identification of Bourn Airfield as a SEL in Policy P2/3.

Chatteris

- 4.36 Identification of this location as a SEL is now supported by both Fenland District Council and the SPAs.
- 4.37 Chatteris is recognised in paragraph 9.38 of the Plan as having a '*relatively weak economy*' and is an area in need of regeneration where priority should be given to promoting economic and employment growth. There were two principal reasons put forward for the proposed allocation. Firstly, it was contended that a SEL allocation here would assist in achieving the objective of Policy P9/6, which states that the town '*will be given priority for economic regeneration*'. Secondly, it was promoted as contributing to the town's role as a 'stepping stone' for the expansion and growth of the 'Cambridge Phenomenon' envisaged in paragraph 2.22 of the Plan.
- 4.38 We have reservations about the ability of Chatteris to attract '*prestige development*' as envisaged for SELs in paragraph 2.22. Nevertheless, the town lies at a key location between the strong economy of the Cambridge area and the relatively weaker economy of the Fenland areas to the north. In terms of economic regeneration and spreading the benefits of economic growth in Cambridge northwards, we accept that the identification of Chatteris as a SEL in Policy P2/3 may provide a helpful signal. However, the effectiveness of the policy in meeting these objectives will need to be kept under review.

Deliverability and a reserve list of SELs

- 4.39 It was suggested that the Plan should include a contingency measure or a reserve list of employment locations which could be drawn upon in the event that the allocated SELs do not come forward. Whilst we understand the arguments for promoting such an approach, we do not consider that a reserve list of locations is either necessary or appropriate for this Plan. Firstly, given the dynamic nature of the economy in most of the Cambridge Sub-Region, it seems unlikely that any available allocated employment land in that part of the Plan area would remain vacant for a long time. Elsewhere in the Plan area we are satisfied that there is a choice and range of employment opportunities and adding to these would not assist take-up of those in the most appropriate locations. Secondly, as the Plan period runs until 2016 there is sufficient time to monitor the uptake of employment land and, where locations have not come forward as expected, seek to address the reasons why this has been the case and, if necessary, identify alternative locations.
- 4.40 It was claimed that the word '*reserved*' in Policy P2/3 implied that the allocated SELs would be held back and that '*provided*' would be more appropriate. The SPAs accepted this and we support the change.

RECOMMENDATION 4D

Amend the first line of Policy P2/3 by replacing the word ‘reserved’ with the word ‘provided’.

Replace the final bullet point in Policy P2/3 with: ‘On land to be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in accordance with P9/3c, at locations close to Addenbrooke’s, between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road, and at Cambridge Airport’

**Amend Policy P2/3 by including the following bullet point:
‘land at Chatteris will assist in the economic regeneration of that town and act as a stepping stone for spreading the economic benefits of the ‘Cambridge Phenomenon’ northwards’**

**Replace the first sentence of paragraph 2.24 with:
‘The new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington will accommodate businesses primarily serving local needs and the needs of the Sub-Region, including possible re-locations from Cambridge (see Policy P9/4).’**

**Replace paragraph 2.27 with:
‘The strategic employment locations on the edge of Cambridge included in land to be released from the Green Belt are allocated for mixed-use development including the expansion of education and research facilities. Paragraphs 9.23-9.26 consider the role of these expanded communities in more detail.’**

APPROACH TO EMPLOYMENT CLUSTERS (Policy P2/4)

- 4.41 Employment clusters have been a key component of the economic growth in the Plan area in recent years. Most renowned are the high-tech and biotech clusters surrounding Cambridge which have been very successful in attracting significant international investment. However, there are also important clusters in other parts of the Plan area relating to a range of industries, including food in Fenland and environmental services in Peterborough. Clusters are an important component of the employment strategy and are therefore afforded high priority in the Plan.
- 4.42 The employment clusters in the Plan area range not only in the nature of their uses, but also in their size and location. We recognise the difficulties of producing a policy that addresses all clusters while at the same time balancing the often competing objectives of continued economic growth and sustainable development. However, in our view, the policy has generally achieved this balance. The first two bullet points in Policy P2/4 seek to address each of the objectives in turn. The first requires LPAs to ‘*take account of the distribution, dynamics and spatial requirements of particular clusters*’ when allocating sites suitable for new and existing employment clusters, whilst the second seeks to ensure that this ‘*provision is made in sustainable locations*’.
- 4.43 It was suggested that the first bullet point of the policy be amended to include the word ‘*synergetic*’. We agree that the value of employment clusters is based on the synergy between related businesses and, on the wider scale, between related clusters. The relevance of this in planning terms is that such businesses wish to be situated in particular

locations e.g. the biotech industries which are clustered at the Babraham Institute. In our view, the point is covered in the policy which requires consideration to be given to the '*spatial requirements of particular clusters*'. The inclusion of the word '*synergetic*' would not add to the Plan.

- 4.44 We were asked to consider whether the Plan should do more to promote the links between Peterborough's environmental clusters and related R&D developments in the Cambridge area. We understand that there is a lot of work going on investigating the relationships between the various hi-tech corridors in the Region. EEDA have produced a report on economic planning sub-regions and planning for clusters which considers the various cluster corridors, including the Cambridge- Peterborough link.³ Policy P2/4 also refers to the linkages and partnerships between successful clusters in the Cambridge Sub-Region and clusters in Peterborough. We see no need for any further reference to these matters in the Plan.
- 4.45 It was put to us that, in order to bring Policy P2/4 into line with Policy P1/1, the words '*rural areas*' in the final bullet point of the policy should be replaced with '*rural centres*'. In our view this would be unduly restrictive. Cluster development covers a wide range of business types, from high-tech research and development to food production and different types of clusters have different requirements in terms of location and number of employees. Some types of cluster development can consist of small-scale businesses such as those referred to in Policy P2/6, which need not be restricted to rural centres. Policy P2/4 is an over-arching policy covering all employment clusters and needs to be sufficiently flexible so as to allow for appropriate development to take place in rural areas.
- 4.46 Overall, we conclude that the policy, as currently worded, provides a suitable strategic framework for the preparation of local plan policies on employment clusters⁴.
- 4.47 Reference was made to Figure 2.1 which seeks to identify employment clusters by plotting in different colours various locations engaged in Research and Development, Tech Services, Electronics, Biotech and Computer Services. We have some doubt as to what this figure is intended to convey and question its value although we make no recommendation on the matter.

RECOMMENDATION 4E

No change to Policy P2/4.

OTHER ISSUES

- 4.48 It was generally agreed by participants that the employment chapter might usefully refer to the role of the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the Greater Peterborough Partnership. The SPAs produced Supplement 20 which includes an appropriate form of words to be added to paragraph 2.29. We agree that this text would be a worthwhile addition to the Plan and recommend its inclusion.

³ East of England Economic Planning Sub-Regions and Planning for Clusters (CD 4.8).

⁴ See Chapter 5 for our conclusions on key worker housing referred to in bullet point 3 of Policy P2/4.

RECOMMENDATION 4F**Add to paragraph 2.29:**

‘A key role will be played by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the Greater Peterborough Partnership in implementing this policy. Both Partnerships are supported by government, local authorities, businesses and other statutory and voluntary agencies. It is recognised that business clusters extend beyond the boundary of the Structure Plan area and joint working (and marketing) across county boundaries is essential to ensuring their successful development.’

KEY DIAGRAM

- 4.49 Our attention was drawn to what appears to be an inconsistency between Policy P2/3 and the Key Diagram. Firstly, the Cambridge Inset of the Key Diagram does not seem to identify Cambridge Airport as a Strategic Employment Location. As the other two SELs on the edge of Cambridge are identified on the Diagram, this is an inconsistency which should be corrected. Secondly, both the Cambridge Inset and the overall Key Diagram refer to ‘Strategic Sites for Employment Development’. This is not consistent with the policy which refers to ‘Strategic Employment Locations’. There is no obvious reason for this discrepancy and therefore we recommend that the Key Diagram and Cambridge Inset be amended to refer to ‘Strategic Employment Locations’.

RECOMMENDATION 4G**Amend the Key Diagram by:**

- including Chatteris as a Strategic Employment Location;
- identifying Cambridge Airport on the Cambridge Inset as a strategic employment location;
- replacing the term *‘Strategic Sites for Employment Development’* by *‘Strategic Employment Locations’* (also on the Cambridge Inset).

CHAPTER 5

HOUSING

- 5.1 In this chapter we consider the policies relating to housing in Chapter 5 of the Structure Plan, namely:
- Overall housing distribution (Policy P5/1);
 - Re-using previously developed land and buildings (Policy P5/2);
 - Density (Policy P5/3);
 - Meeting locally identified housing needs (Policy P5/4).

OVERALL HOUSING DISTRIBUTION (POLICY P5/1)

- 5.2 Policy P5/1 provides for the construction of 70,200 new homes in the Structure Plan area between 1999-2016, distributed as follows:

Cambridge City	12,500
East Cambridgeshire	7,300
Fenland	8,100
Huntingdonshire	9,500
South Cambridgeshire	20,000
Peterborough	12,800
<hr/>	
Total	70,200

- 5.3 The key issues arising from the debate at the EIP are:
- whether the plan correctly interprets and applies Regional Planning Guidance in relation to the overall scale and broad distribution of housing provision;
 - whether the allocation of housing among the Districts is soundly based, having regard to demographic, economic and policy-based considerations, including the extent to which the pattern of existing commitments may have unduly influenced the distribution;
 - whether the housing figures are deliverable and whether the Plan sets out an adequate framework for monitoring and managing the delivery of housing and for reviewing the distribution in the light of changing circumstances.
- 5.4 We deal with each of these issues below. We consider the more detailed distribution of housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region (Policy P9/2) and the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire Sub-Region (Policy P10/1) in Chapters 7 and 10 respectively.

Overall Scale of Housing Provision

- 5.5 The level of housing provided for in the Plan derives directly from RPG6 Policy 8. This indicates that the Structure Plan area as a whole should plan for an increase of 4,000 dwellings per annum, comprising 2,800 per annum in the Cambridge Sub-Region and 1,200 per annum in the rest of the Structure Plan area (ie Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire). It was explained to us by GO-East that these figures were derived from

a notional 70:30 split of the total requirement as between the Cambridge Sub-Region and the Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area, drawn from the Panel Report into the draft RPG.

- 5.6 The RPG6 strategy is aimed at achieving a more sustainable balance between rates of growth in jobs and housing by planning for the Cambridge Sub-Region to accommodate a higher proportion of the region's housing development. RPG6 recognises that this represents a significant shift from existing patterns of development and indicates that action should be taken to ensure that the housing figures are achievable by 2006 at the latest.
- 5.7 Based on this guidance, the figures in Policy P5/1 assume a build up of the annual housing rate in the Cambridge Sub-Region from 2,400 in the period 1996-2001, to 2,600 in the period 2001-2006 and reaching 2,800 in the period 2006-2016. Conversely, the annual housing provision in the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area assumes a reduction from 1,600 in the period 1996-2001 to 1,400 in the period 2001-2006 and 1,200 in the period 2006-2016. In arriving at the total of 70,200 dwellings between 1999-2016 the SPAs have adjusted for the number of houses built in the period 1996-1999.
- 5.8 In the Panel's view this represents an appropriate interpretation of the RPG6 requirement and one which produces, for the area as a whole, an average annual provision slightly in excess of the 4,000 set by RPG6 Policy 8, thus allowing for a backlog of unmet demand in the period 1996-2001 when the actual house-building rate fell below 4,000 per annum.
- 5.9 A few arguments were advanced at the EIP in favour of a higher level of housing, based on the need to meet the increased proportion of affordable housing provision identified in the Plan and on slightly different approaches to addressing the backlog. It was also suggested that RPG6 is now somewhat out-dated and that the Structure Plan should take account of recent announcements by the Deputy Prime Minister regarding the delivery of housing, especially in the London-Stansted-Cambridge corridor¹, and the SERAS report identifying Alconbury as a potential regional airport².
- 5.10 We note that RPG6 (paragraph 4.17) suggests that in Cambridgeshire demographic and economic factors might justify a higher housing figure. However, it goes on to say that the adequacy of the initial target should be reviewed through the RPG for the East of England, drawing on the results of further work on urban capacity and the outcome of monitoring. This is also in line with advice in PPG3 (paragraph 7) which makes it clear that any changes in housing provision figures in structure plans should be as a result of a revision in RPG or, where this is not practicable, in the context of clear advice from the Regional Planning Body (RPB).
- 5.11 In the Panel's view it would be premature for this Structure Plan to depart from the figures in RPG6. Work has already started on an up-date of RPG for the East of England (RPG14). We assume that this will take on board the outcome of the on-going sub-regional study into growth in the London-Stansted-Cambridge corridor and, if appropriate, any decisions arising from the SERAS study. It will also be able to take into account new demographic information and household projections arising from the 2001 Census. Any resultant revision of the housing figures for Cambridgeshire would then need to be reflected in the next review of the Structure Plan or its successor document(s).

¹ Statement by the Deputy Prime Minister to Parliament, 18 July 2002.

² The Future Development of Air Transport in the UK: South East, Department for Transport July 2002.

- 5.12 As it is, the scale of housing growth required in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is significantly greater than that experienced in recent years: an average over the period 1999-2016 of 4,130 dwellings per annum, compared with 3,370 per annum³ between 1991-1999. The increase in annual growth rate is proportionately even greater for the Cambridge Sub-Region: 2,790 per annum compared with 2,030 per annum. For the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area the required rate of growth is below that achieved in recent years. This shift in the growth rate is very challenging and the Panel is satisfied that it is right for this Structure Plan to focus on achieving the present target rather than contemplating even higher provision.

District-level Allocations

- 5.13 The distribution of housing amongst the districts is ‘policy-based’ rather than being derived directly from trend-based projections of population and households.⁴ The SPAs explained that a considerable amount of work had been undertaken on examining the capacity available across the Structure Plan area to meet the levels of growth identified in RPG6. The strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region seeks to locate the majority of new housing in or close to Cambridge, in accordance with the sequential approach in RPG6. In the Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area the focus is upon concentrating development in Peterborough City.
- 5.14 Economic and demographic projections have been used, in parallel with the capacity studies, in order to seek a better balance between job forecasts and housing for each area. Some adjustments to the initial housing allocation have been made, for instance in Huntingdonshire, to ensure that housing provision meets the needs of the forecast natural population growth.

Commitments

- 5.15 A major issue is the extent to which existing housing commitments have driven the district level allocations and whether these are compatible with the new strategic approach to sustainable development. Of the total provision of 70,200 dwellings nearly 70%, as at mid-2001, are accounted for by existing commitments, namely land with planning permission, local plan allocations and estimated windfalls/brownfield sites. This leaves only 21,176 dwellings requiring new land, of which 20,655 are in the Cambridge Sub-Region and less than 1,000 in the Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area.
- 5.16 Some participants questioned whether a sufficiently rigorous examination had been undertaken of commitments to ensure that they are all in sustainable locations and that densities are in line with PPG3. Concerns were also expressed about the basis for calculating the yield from windfalls/brownfield sites. The Technical Report to the Structure Plan (CD 1.3) indicates that sites with planning permission and land allocated in Local Plans have been subject to a ‘*preliminary assessment*’ regarding the likelihood of meeting the requirements of PPG3. Also, in order to reflect PPG25 ‘Development and Flood Risk’, land deemed to be at a high risk of flooding has been excluded.
- 5.17 At the Panel’s request, the SPAs provided more information on the assessment of commitments in order to throw some light on the impact of the exercise.⁵ This shows that

³ Table 4, page 21, CD1.3.1.

⁴ Details are set out in the Technical Report in Support of the Deposit Draft Plan (CD 1.3), together with the Technical Report Supplement, Oct 2002 (CD 1.3.1).

⁵ SPA Supplement 9 (op. cit.)

some sites with outline planning permission or allocated in Local Plans have been reviewed and excluded because of their poor location in relation to PPG3 or PPG25 criteria. Assumptions on the densities likely to be achieved have also been reviewed and increased, generally to 30 dwellings per hectare or more. The net effect has been to increase the yield from land with planning permission but reduce the yield expected from allocated sites. In the case of windfalls/ brownfield sites the position varies from district to district. Some have followed the government guidance in 'Tapping the Potential' (DETR, December 2000) and allowed only for brownfield windfalls; others have based their calculations on past trends and not sought to make any reduction for sites being greenfield development. To this extent there may be some over-estimation of the likely yield from windfalls.

- 5.18 Overall, the Panel is satisfied that the review of commitments has been as robust as it is reasonable to expect at a strategic level. We understand the argument of some participants that the review ought to have taken into account the RPG6 criteria, reflecting the sequential approach to development, as well as PPG3 and PPG25. It is clear that many of the commitments, particularly in the Cambridge Sub-Region, are a 'hangover' from the former Structure Plan strategy and that if one was starting from a clean sheet the pattern of land release in relation to the new strategy might be rather different.
- 5.19 However, we recognise that there are two factors pulling in somewhat different directions:
- the imperative of meeting the higher housing target set by RPG6;
 - the desire to move as soon as possible towards a more sustainable pattern of development.

Although both of these RPG objectives are important, it is clear from all we heard at the EIP that the pre-eminent objective is to meet the housing target. Wholesale abandonment of existing commitments, even if it was practicable, would throw into question the ability to meet the higher levels of housing provision sought by RPG6, given the time taken to bring the new strategic land releases into play. In particular, the commitments are needed to ensure that the level of house building does not stall in the early years of the Plan period.

- 5.20 This is not to say that all these existing commitments should now be regarded as immutable. Structure Plan Policy P1/4 'Plan, Monitor and Manage' indicates that Local Plan Reviews will include an early review of existing land allocations together with appropriate mechanisms for continuous management and review of development. We fully endorse this approach. Although we are satisfied that the broad allocation of housing among the districts does not need to be revised at this stage there is still scope for districts individually, or jointly in the case of the Cambridge Sub-Region, to seek a more sustainable pattern of development by reviewing commitments and re-allocating sites to more sustainable locations wherever possible. This is a theme to which we return in Chapters 7 and 10.

Proposed Changes to District Housing Allocations

- 5.21 We now turn to other proposals put forward by participants for re-allocating the district level housing totals. Some of these would involve breaching the split of total housing provision between Cambridge Sub-Region and the Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area and are unacceptable on this score alone. Others are predicated upon bids for different locations for the new settlement in the Cambridge Sub-Region or upon a

different disposition of strategic land releases. We deal with these in detail in Chapters 8 and 9.

- 5.22 The only change arising from our recommendations which might affect the pattern of development up to 2016, is a proposal in Chapter 8 that a further site in the Green Belt west of Trumpington Road should be released for development. As explained in Chapter 7, we have not made any changes to the distribution of housing within the Cambridge Sub-Region as a consequence of this recommendation. However, the potential this affords for more development close to Cambridge ought to be reflected as soon as possible in the re-allocation of housing from less sustainable locations further out.
- 5.23 Otherwise we heard nothing to persuade us that there is a case for fundamentally revisiting the housing figures in Policy P5/1. Certain complications arise from the split of the housing allocation for Huntingdonshire, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire Districts between the Cambridge Sub-Region and Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area, which we deal with in more detail in Chapters 7 and 10 respectively. However, we have found no compelling reason to re-allocate housing on this score.
- 5.24 We also heard arguments from developers in favour of re-allocating dwellings from South Cambridgeshire to Huntingdonshire or to East Cambridgeshire. It was suggested that the Market Towns of Huntingdon, St. Ives, St. Neots and Ely were more sustainable locations in RPG6 terms than villages in South Cambridgeshire and/or that the new settlement and Green Belt releases would not deliver sufficient homes within the Plan period. We do not accept these arguments. The whole thrust of the Strategy is to locate more housing close to jobs in the Cambridge area. Although the Market Towns are sustainable locations in their own right there is a danger that allocating more housing to Huntingdonshire and East Cambridgeshire would simply exacerbate long-distance commuting into Cambridge, the reverse of what the strategy is seeking to achieve.
- 5.25 Fenland District Council sought to make a case for an increased housing allocation for their area. The concern here is that the allocation of only 8,100 dwellings leaves very little scope for new land allocations over and above existing commitments and windfall allowances. It was pointed out that the joint Structure Plan consultation exercise identified considerable support for growth in Fenland and that restricting the rate of growth of population and potential workforce could hinder the Council's aspirations for economic growth and regeneration in March, Wisbech and Chatteris.
- 5.26 We discuss the position of the Fenland Market Towns in more detail in Chapters 7 and 10. We are not convinced that allocating more housing to Fenland is a sensible proposition. As with Huntingdonshire and East Cambridgeshire there is a danger that this might result in more long-distance commuting, either to Peterborough or Cambridge. Although there has already been some re-allocation of housing sites within Fenland it seems to us that the needs of March and Wisbech ought first to be addressed by reviewing the considerable scale of existing commitments. In the case of Chatteris, Policy P9/6 already indicates that further housing allocations should be dependent on improving job prospects, an approach which we endorse in Chapter 7. We note that the average annual rate of housing proposed in Fenland (around 470 dwellings per annum) is only slightly below that experienced over the last 10 years or so. We therefore conclude that there is not a sufficiently strong case for changing the allocation in the Plan.
- 5.27 To summarise, we do not propose any changes to the distribution of housing in Policy P5/1. We agree with the SPAs, LPAs and others who argued that the present strategy is a pragmatic response to delivering the vision set out in RPG6 and that this Structure Plan

has moved as far as is reasonable towards meeting the sequential approach in RPG, whilst setting the foundation for future change. As we note in Chapter 2, it will take time to turn the ‘supertanker of development’ fully towards a more sustainable direction.

- 5.28 On a small point of detail, we recommend that the opening sentence of the policy should refer to the ‘*provision of additional dwellings*’ rather than the ‘*construction of new dwellings*’. This is consistent with our recommendations on Policy P9/2 for the Cambridge Sub-Region (see Chapter 7)

Delivery of the Housing Figures

- 5.29 As indicated above, the Structure Plan looks to a substantial increase in the annual house building rate, especially in the Cambridge Sub-Region. In Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire the combined average annual rate of completions required by the Plan is over 1,900 dwellings; this compares with 1,000 dwellings per annum set by the 1995 Structure Plan and an actual completion rate of only around 900 dwellings per annum in the period since 1991. Conversely, house building rates within East Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire and the Fenland Districts are set to fall when compared with the previous Plan or with past trends.
- 5.30 A number of participants expressed doubts about whether the higher level of growth in the Cambridge Sub-Region is achievable, especially given the degree to which the Strategy relies upon substantial releases of land from the Green Belt and the completion of 6,000 dwellings by 2016 in the new settlement. Concerns were also expressed about the need for major housing releases to be closely linked with the provision of infrastructure. These are matters which we address in more detail in Chapters 6, 7 and 9.

Guidance on Phasing

- 5.31 A key question which participants highlighted in this context is whether the Structure Plan currently provides adequate guidance for Local Plans to ensure that the housing figures are met in full and within the required timescales. At present Policy P1/4 ‘Plan, Monitor and Manage’ merely refers in general terms to a number of mechanisms which may be triggered as a result of monitoring the Plan:
- action to secure timely provision of infrastructure;
 - advice to Local Planning Authorities in relation to amendments to Local Plan policies and phasing;
 - review of the Structure Plan in whole or in part.
- 5.32 The policy also makes it clear that it is a matter for Local Plans to provide mechanisms for continuous management and review of the form and phasing of development in response to changing circumstances. Appropriate mechanisms may include trigger points for:
- release of sites and the phasing of development;
 - infrastructure requirements;
 - further review of land allocations;
 - policy reviews.
- 5.33 Many participants felt that this did not go far enough. It was variously suggested that the Plan ought to include:

- more guidance on the phasing of development, especially in relation to the timing of delivery of infrastructure;
 - identification of additional development opportunities to provide greater flexibility, or inclusion of an enabling policy requiring reserve sites to be identified in Local Plans to meet any shortfall in provision;
 - a mechanism for re-allocating housing between districts in the Cambridge Sub-Region to ensure that any failure of major sites to come forward does not result in allocations having to be shifted to less sustainable locations within the same district.
- 5.34 Whilst the Panel has some sympathy with these views the key question is how much detail it is appropriate to include in the Structure Plan. During the EIP the SPAs presented further information on the potential phasing of housing development by 5-year periods in each district and in the two sub-areas (SPA Supplement 6). This is helpful in showing that a steady phasing of development over the Plan period is possible in each area. It also shows that there is already a degree of flexibility within the Cambridge Sub-Region to call upon additional alternative sites in the event of delays in the availability of sites assessed as likely to come forward prior to 2016. The Panel's own recommendations in respect of an additional Green Belt release west of Trumpington Road and further growth at Cambourne will potentially enhance this flexibility, as well as providing further capacity for development beyond 2016.
- 5.35 In addition, SPA Supplement 31 provides indicative phasing and delivery plans for the Cambridge Sub-Region and the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire Sub-Region which link housing development and major locations with the delivery of major transport infrastructure.
- 5.36 Whilst there was no time at the EIP to examine all this material in detail it does appear to go a good way to meeting the concerns expressed by participants. In the case of SPA Supplement 31 we agree that this material should be included in the supporting text to the relevant Structure Plan chapters dealing with the Cambridge and Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire Sub-Regions respectively. We also endorse the SPAs' proposal to include additional text in support of Policy P6/1 'Development-related Provision' recognising the need for a tightly managed programme of implementation carefully phased over the Plan period and cross-referring to the information in the sub-regional chapters.
- 5.37 As for the information in SPA Supplement 6, we regard this as too detailed for inclusion in the Structure Plan. However, we see no reason why such details should not appear in the form of Supplementary Planning Guidance, either relating to the Structure Plan area as a whole or, perhaps more usefully, for the two sub-regions separately. Provided such guidance is subject to public consultation this will enable the information on phasing to carry weight in the preparation of Local Plans whilst being in a form which is more readily reviewed and up-dated in the light of changing circumstances. A reference to the SPG should be included in Policy P5/1 and in Policies P9/2 and P10/1.
- 5.38 We also agree with the need for special arrangements to deal flexibly with the management and re-allocation of housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region. The housing distribution for the Sub-Region has been based on a sequential assessment of the capacity in the built-up area of Cambridge, in urban expansions on land capable of release from the Green Belt, in the new settlement and in the Market Towns, after allowing for commitments. The strategic planning unit is thus essentially the Sub-Region as a whole and not individual districts. If any significant re-allocation of housing development is

needed as a result of major sites not coming forward it follows that the area of search should be the Sub-Region not the district. The availability of phasing information in the form of SPG will obviously help.

- 5.39 This is a task which should be undertaken jointly by the LPAs via the Stakeholder Partnership. The Partnership will need to determine at what point any changes in housing allocations are sufficiently strategic in nature to warrant an amendment to the Structure Plan or its successor document. A reference to the need for such a process should be incorporated in the supporting text to Policy P9/2. Our proposals in Chapter 7 that Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Council should work closely together on planning, monitoring and managing the release of housing sites in and around Cambridge and that their housing figures in Policy P9/2 should be bracketed for this purpose, also provides a greater degree of flexibility in responding to changing circumstances. Finally, we have also recommended that the figures in Policy P9/2 should be regarded as indicative only.

Speeding Up the Planning Process

- 5.40 Delivery of the housing development targets will also depend on the speed with which the Structure Plan figures can be translated into Local Plan allocations. This applies particularly to those strategic land releases which are dependent upon a review of Green Belt boundaries. Some participants expressed doubts, based on past experience, as to whether Local Plans can be put in place fast enough.
- 5.41 At the Panel's request, the SPAs prepared a schedule showing the timetables for Local Plan reviews (SPA Supplement 13). This shows that the Plans for Cambridge City, East Cambridgeshire, South Cambridgeshire and Fenland are expected to be in place by the end of 2005 and that those for Huntingdonshire and Peterborough will follow in 2006. Achievement of these targets will involve a significantly faster programming than has been the case in the past. However, given that the Structure Plan itself will already have provided a development framework at a greater level of detail than is usual, we see no reason why these dates should not be achieved, especially since a great deal of parallel working between Local Plans and the Structure Plan is built into the timetable.
- 5.42 In due course the new system of Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) will supersede the Local Plans. The greater flexibility afforded by LDFs should, in principle, enable a faster translation of the Structure Plan provisions to the local level and make it easier to incorporate any amendments which may be required as a result of monitoring.
- 5.43 The extent to which the house building rates can be achieved depends ultimately on the ability of the house builders to deliver. There were differences of view at the EIP as to why recent building rates in Cambridgeshire, including the Cambridge area itself, were falling short of planned provision, despite the buoyant housing market.
- 5.44 The LPAs suggested that this was not due to lack of sites, as Local Plans had included land well in excess of the normal levels of supply required by national policy guidance. There is also a considerable amount of land with planning permission in the pipeline. In some instances, for example in the Hampton Township in Peterborough, there are particular local reasons which have slowed down delivery. Otherwise, the HBF and others suggested that a multiplicity of factors might combine to influence the rate at which housing comes forward, including marketability of sites, the need for expensive remediation or infrastructure and the need to negotiate complex Section 106 agreements.

Lack of public resources to enable the provision of the affordable element of housing allocations might also be a factor.

- 5.45 Whatever the reasons for the shortfall in house building in the past, it is vitally important that the building industry and the LPAs should work closely together in monitoring and managing the future delivery of homes and in identifying and remedying any obstacles to sites coming forward. It was encouraging in this context that the involvement of developers and house builders in the Stakeholder Partnership is seen as an important mechanism in overcoming problems.

RECOMMENDATION 5A

No change to the housing figures in Policy P5/1. Amend the opening sentence to refer to ‘70,200 additional homes between 1999-2016’

Include reference in Policies P5/1, P9/2 and P10/1 to the intention to prepare Supplementary Planning Guidance on the phasing of housing development in order to facilitate the monitoring and management of delivery of housing and to guide phasing policies in Local Plans.

Include an additional paragraph in the supporting text to Policy P6/1 – Development-related Provision, based on SPA Supplement 31, as follows:

‘Achieving the rate of high quality development and transport infrastructure required by 2016 will require a tightly managed programme of implementation – carefully phased over the Plan period. There will be a close interdependency between major infrastructure projects and housing development. As circumstances change the programme will need to be adapted and kept up to date. For this reason a detailed programme cannot usefully be included in the Structure Plan at this stage. However, a broad indication of phasing in relation to delivery of infrastructure is given in the relevant sub-regional chapters.’

Add to the supporting text of Policies P9/10 – Cambridge Sub-Region Transport Strategy and P10/7 – Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy indicative information on the phasing of housing development in relation to the delivery of major transport infrastructure, as in SPA Supplement 31 (see Chapter 6).

Include an additional paragraph in the supporting text of Policy P9/2 referring to the need for monitoring and reviewing the housing figures across the Cambridge Sub-Region as a whole (see Recommendation 7B).

RE-USING PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND AND BUILDINGS (Policy P5/2)

- 5.46 Policy P5/2 requires at least 50% of new dwellings to be built on previously developed land or utilise existing buildings. Targets are set for each local planning authority as follows:

- Cambridge City 55%;
- East Cambridgeshire 25%;
- Fenland 30%;

- Huntingdonshire 40%;
- South Cambridgeshire 35%;
- Peterborough 75%.

The supporting text refers to the fact that 39% of new homes have been built on previously developed land in recent years (paragraph 5.8).

5.47 Four main issues arise from the debate at the EIP:

- whether the Plan should include a specific definition of previously developed land;
- the appropriateness of the targets set in Policy P5/2;
- whether there is a need for phasing to ensure that previously developed land is brought forward throughout the Plan period;
- whether the targets are capable of meaningful monitoring.

Definition of previously developed land

5.48 A number of participants suggested that because of the presence of large former military sites, only parts of which were built upon, the Structure Plan ought to provide a specific definition of previously developed land as it will apply to the Structure Plan area and, especially, to the Cambridge Sub-Region.

5.49 Annex C to PPG3 sets out the definition of previously developed land as *‘that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure and associated fixed surface infrastructure’*. The definition includes defence buildings. Footnote 2 to the definition makes it clear that *‘all of the land within the curtilage of the site will also be defined as previously developed’*. It is this latter point which appears to be of particular concern to some participants. However, the footnote goes on to say that *‘this does not mean that the whole area of the curtilage should, therefore, be redeveloped’*. It is also clear from paragraph 31 of PPG3 that the availability of previously developed land is only one of the considerations to be assessed when local planning authorities are deciding which sites to allocate for housing. Other issues to be considered are:

- the location and accessibility of potential development sites;
- the capacity of existing and potential infrastructure;
- the ability to build communities; and
- the physical and environmental constraints on development of land.

5.50 These considerations are reflected in the Plan, for example, in policies:

- P1/1 (as amended by us) which seeks to steer development towards locations accessible by walking, cycling and public transport;
- P8/1 which seeks to achieve sustainable development by integrating land use and transport;
- P6/1 which seeks to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is provided in association with new development;
- P1/3 which seeks to ensure that the design of built development meets the needs of all sections of the community;

- P1/2 which imposes environmental constraints on development to protect the area's most important environmental assets.

5.51 Thus, reading the Plan as a whole, there are sufficient safeguards to ensure that, although the re-use of previously developed land is to be afforded the highest priority under Policy P1/1, the Plan does not seek to encourage the inappropriate re-use of such land. In the Panel's view the definition of previously developed land in Annex C to PPG3 is as relevant to this Structure Plan area as to any other and no useful purpose would be served by including a more specific definition of the term in the Plan. However, the supporting text to the policy might usefully indicate that the term is defined in Annex C to PPG3.

The appropriateness of the targets

5.52 The debate on this issue concerned:

- the origin of the targets;
- their realism; and
- whether they should be treated as indicative or aspirational aims or as minimum targets to be achieved.

5.53 The SPAs confirmed that the 50% overall target derives from RPG6, Policy 5 of which states that *'At least 50% of additional dwellings should be developed on previously used land or by conversion of existing buildings'*. The SPAs describe this target as 'challenging'. However, we note that the Panel which examined RPG6, in concluding that the regional target should be set at 40%, nevertheless found that this would *'equate roughly to 50% in Cambridgeshire'*⁶. In our view, given the national target of 60% and the clear message from RPG6 that *'there is significant potential to improve current performance, drawing on PPG3 and capacity studies'* any reduction in the overall target for the Plan area would not be acceptable. It is also our view that the 50% figure needs to be seen as a meaningful target to be achieved over the Plan period and not an aspirational aim. This will provide the necessary driver to assist LPAs in the delivery of the improved efficiency in the use of land in their areas required by PPG3.

5.54 However, it is acknowledged by the SPAs that, if each LPA achieves their minimum target, that will deliver only 45% of new dwellings on previously developed land and not 50%. Hence, the supporting text states that *'to achieve 50% for the Plan area the minimum targets for P5/2 will need to be exceeded by some City and District Councils'* (paragraph 5.9). In our view this is an unsatisfactory approach for the Structure Plan to take. Either the overall target ought to be reduced to reflect the outcome which would be achieved if each of the individual targets is met or the individual targets ought to be revised to deliver the overall target. In the light of our comments above, the latter would be the more appropriate option.

5.55 Turning to the individual targets, there was some concern expressed by a number of the LPAs as to their status and achievability given, for example, that in Huntingdonshire only 9% of allocations in their current Local Plan are on previously developed land and in South Cambridgeshire the figure is 10.6%. Following our discussion on this issue the SPAs submitted Supplement 16⁷ which shows that all the LPAs except Huntingdonshire

⁶ Paragraph 312, RPG for East Anglia Panel Report (CD 4.10).

⁷ This updated Table 3.10 in Technical Report Supplement Oct 2002 (CD 1.3.1) to provide the figure for the percentage of new homes built on previously developed land as a net rather than a gross figure.

and South Cambridgeshire have been achieving a higher percentage of new homes built on previously developed land than they are required to do under Policy 5/2. The Panel notes that Huntingdonshire say they are striving to achieve 40% and that in 2001 they achieved 34%.

- 5.56 All the LPAs are carrying out urban capacity studies and reviewing their allocations to inform their Local Plan reviews. The only authority to have completed this process is Cambridge City Council who conclude that between 49% and 65% of completions are likely to be on previously developed land, depending on whether brownfield land at Cambridge Airport comes forward for development during the Plan period. We consider Cambridge Airport later in this report (Chapter 8) and conclude that there can be no certainty that it will come forward within the Plan period. However, under the plan, monitor and manage process if it became clear that Cambridge Airport was not likely to come forward within the Plan period, the target for Cambridge City may need to be reviewed.
- 5.57 It was suggested to us that the targets ought not to be put into the policy but included in the supporting text. In our view this would not be appropriate as it would lessen the status of the overall target of 50% and make it more difficult to monitor progress towards meeting it. We accept that there is a degree of uncertainty as to the origins of the individual targets and their realism, as they are not based on an in-depth study of the capacity of each LPA to accommodate development on previously developed land. However, for plan, monitor and manage to work it is necessary to make absolutely clear at this stage what the LPAs need to achieve in order for the target for the Structure Plan area as a whole to be delivered. Thus the targets ought to be in the policy.
- 5.58 In view of our earlier conclusion that the targets ought to be set at a level which will actually deliver at least 50% of new dwellings on previously developed land, it will be necessary for the SPAs, prior to the modifications stage of the Plan, to discuss with the LPAs the revised targets to be set in Policy P5/2 in the light of their urban capacity studies and any other information which is available to them.

Phasing

- 5.59 We were asked to consider whether the Plan ought to require phasing to ensure that land is released so as to maximise the re-use of previously developed land in preference to the release of greenfield sites. It was also suggested to us that the Plan should provide some mechanism whereby authorities can work together to ensure the delivery of the targets.
- 5.60 In this context, it was contended that in the Cambridge Sub-Region there could be a conflict between meeting the build rate and meeting the target for the re-use of previously developed land. As indicated earlier in this chapter, the delivery of the annual build rate is critical to the achievement of the overall strategy. However, delivering urban renaissance and meeting the targets for re-use of previously developed land, when taken over the Plan period as a whole, need not be altogether incompatible with the delivery of the house building rate. The key to reconciling these potentially conflicting aims is provided by Policy P1/1, which sets out the selection criteria for delivering development sites, and Policy P1/4, which requires Local Plan Reviews to *'provide mechanisms for continuous management and review of the form and phasing of development'* as part of the plan, monitor and manage process.

- 5.61 We see no need for further guidance on phasing to be included in Policy P5/2. We have already endorsed the SPAs' suggestions for the introduction of Supplementary Planning Guidance on phasing, which should help in monitoring and managing the delivery of the brownfield targets. We recognise that delivery of the build rate may lead to the targets in Policy P5/2 being achieved later rather than earlier in the Plan period, especially since previously developed land at the Airport and the new settlement will only come into play at a later date. This also needs to be reflected in the supporting text to this policy.
- 5.62 In response to concerns about bringing forward previously developed land the SPAs submitted some additional text to include at the end of paragraph 5.9 of the Plan (SPA Supplement 22). This makes clear that, if monitoring were to show that targets were not being met, the LPAs would need to consider amending the phasing in their local plans or take other appropriate corrective action. We consider that the need to bring such land forward is sufficiently important that this requirement should be incorporated into the policy itself.
- 5.63 As to authorities working together, we note that one of the companion documents to PPG3 'Planning to Deliver',⁸ states that the Structure Plan should '*where appropriate, provide the framework within which adjoining authorities operate complementary approaches for releasing sites in order to maximise the re-use of previously developed land in an urban area*' (page 21). In our view, there would be practical difficulties in applying this approach to the Structure Plan area as a whole. However, we have already concluded previously in this chapter that there is merit in joint working between South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City in relation to the delivery of the housing numbers. In doing so, the authorities might be expected to work together to ensure that previously developed land is given preference over the release of greenfield land in meeting the house building targets. We do not propose to merge their targets as this might lead to difficulties in monitoring at the local level. However, if our suggestion is accepted that these two authorities should in the future consider preparing a joint Local Development Framework under the new planning arrangements, then a single target for the Cambridge area would make sense.

Monitoring

- 5.64 It was agreed by all that monitoring the targets on the basis of net figures rather than gross, ie the number of additional dwellings created using previously developed land, is a better reflection of what is actually happening on the ground and is therefore more appropriate to the Structure Plan. There is some practical difficulty about this as the monitoring done by LPAs using the Best Value Indicators requires the use of gross not net figures⁹. In our view, it is unhelpful for the Best Value Indicators to operate in such a way that they cannot easily be used to monitor the Structure Plan (and indeed RPG) targets, which are expressed in net rather than gross terms.
- 5.65 The inconsistency between the Best Value approach and that adopted for monitoring Development Plan targets is one which the Panel consider might usefully be addressed at the national level. For the purposes of the Structure Plan, it will be necessary for the SPAs, in consultation with the other LPAs, to establish a consistent and agreed method of monitoring, if the Best Value regime cannot be relied upon. We note from a

⁸ Planning to Deliver; the managed release of housing sites: towards better practice. DTLR July 2001 (CD 5.22.1).

⁹ BV106 Building on previously developed land states that '*The number of new buildings including conversion should be the gross rather than the net figure*'.

supplementary statement provided for us by the City Council¹⁰ that, in their area, the difference between the use of a gross as opposed to a net figure does not, in practice, make a material difference to the outcome.

RECOMMENDATION 5B

Review the individual targets for the LPAs set in Policy P5/2 in the light of the results of the urban capacity studies and any other information and ensure that they are set at a level whereby if all are met they will deliver the overall target of at least 50% during the Structure Plan period.

Add the following to the policy: *‘If monitoring shows that the targets are not being met local planning authorities should take appropriate action to encourage the bringing forward of previously developed land’.*

Add to paragraph 5.6 *‘Policy P1/4 provides the mechanisms for the Plan, Monitor and Manage process which will be critical to ensuring the delivery of the targets set in Policy P5/2.’*

Insert *‘Annex C to PPG3 ‘Housing’ defines previously developed land’* at the end of paragraph 5.7.

Add to paragraph 5.8 *‘It is recognised that delivery of the build rate in the Cambridge Sub-Region may lead to the targets in Policy 5/2 being achieved later rather than earlier in the Plan period’.*

Redraft paragraph 5.9 in the light of the first recommendation above.

Establish a consistent and agreed method of monitoring in consultation with the LPAs.

DENSITY (Policy P5/3)

5.66 Policy P5/3 requires that new housing development maximises the efficiency in the use of sites and sets guidelines to be followed of:

- 50 dwellings per hectare (dph) or more on city centre sites;
- 40 dph or more on sites with good (or potentially good) accessibility and close to a good range of existing or potential facilities and services; and
- 30dph or more elsewhere.

5.67 Four main issues arise out of the debate at the EIP:

- whether there is a need for a policy on densities, given the advice in PPG3;
- whether the policy would achieve the intended aim of driving densities up across the Structure Plan area as a whole;

¹⁰ Supplementary Statement from Cambridge City Council 4 November 2002

- whether the policy is too prescriptive and insufficiently responsive to the impact of development on the character of areas;
- whether the policy can be monitored effectively.

Policy on density

- 5.68 A number of participants suggested that there is no need for a policy on density in the Plan as there is sufficient guidance in PPG3. Paragraph 58 of PPG3 requires LPAs to *'encourage housing development which makes more efficient use of land (between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare net)'* and to *'seek greater intensity of development at places with good public transport accessibility or around major nodes along good quality public transport corridors'*. Delivering higher densities than have been traditionally achieved in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough needs to be a fundamental part of the strategy of the Plan. In the Panel's view this is less likely to be achieved consistently across the Plan area without some additional guidance in the Structure Plan which is more specific to the area.

Effectiveness of the policy as drafted

- 5.69 The Panel find the policy as written lacks clear justification, with the three levels appearing arbitrary and liable to be applied as standards rather than guidelines. As such it could have the opposite effect of what is intended. In our view, to make the policy effective it needs firstly to make it clear that housing densities will need to be increased across the Structure Plan area. This will help to signal the change in direction which this Structure Plan is seeking to achieve, away from the approach of the existing Structure Plan, which seeks an average density of 25-30 dph (Policy SP4/2).
- 5.70 The Panel also shares the concern of many of the participants that the policy is too prescriptive in its present format. We agree with the general approach of the SPAs to try to ensure that the more accessible the location the higher the densities which ought to be capable of being delivered. We do not, however, think it helpful for the Plan to be too specific about the density levels which may be achieved at the upper end of the scale. Referring to 50dph could effectively depress the potential for very much higher densities being encouraged in appropriate locations. We also feel that restricting the highest densities to city centres is inappropriate. The potential for achieving the highest densities exists in or close to city and Market Town centres, in planned new communities and in locations with access to high quality public transport services, as defined in Policy P8/6. The policy should make this clear.
- 5.71 We consider that it is important for the Plan to be specific about the lower end of the scale and make it clear that densities of below 30 dph would not be acceptable. We recognise the concern of those who say that there are locations where densities of 30 dph would not be appropriate because it would lead to development which would be out of character with the area. However, we do not accept that this need be the case. In the document *'Better Places to Live'*¹¹ DTLR/CABE *'challenge local authorities to think more imaginatively about design and layout'* (foreword page 5). In relation to density and space standards, which is often an issue of concern to those who oppose higher densities, the document states *'It is a common misunderstanding that higher densities need to result in lower standards of space around and within the home'* (page 62).

¹¹ Companion Guide to PPG 3 'By Design – Better Places to Live', September 2001 (CD 5.22.2).

- 5.72 We also note the advice on ‘place-making’ in ‘By Design-Towards Better Practice’¹² that *‘Many factors determine or influence the outcome of the design process and the sort of places we make’*. One of those factors is the approach taken to designing for a specific site. There will not be one design solution to a particular site and the outcome will depend on a number of factors both relating to the site itself and to the requirements of any particular brief. One of those requirements will be to make the most efficient use of land by maximising the density. In our view, a minimum density requirement of 30dph need not lead to out of character development in the Structure Plan area, although in implementing the policy LPAs should be required to have regard to local character.
- 5.73 There were a number of criticisms of the inclusion of a 40dph level, mainly that it seemed to have been adopted simply because it represents the middle level between 30 and 50 dph. Whether or not that is the case, we do not see any particular harm in the SPAs seeking to drive up densities by encouraging all LPAs to adopt a higher starting point for those locations where there is a good range of services and good accessibility. We recognise that over the Structure Plan area as a whole there could be different interpretations of what these criteria mean. In practice, it will be for each LPA to determine to which locations this level should apply. By having a common starting point the Structure Plan will help to deliver a degree of consistency in how density policies are developed and applied across the Structure Plan area.
- 5.74 In our view, the policy needs to be redrafted to place the emphasis on the need to drive up densities and to seek to avoid a form of ‘tick-box’ mentality which might result from setting what appears to be three levels of density. It should also be made clear that when developing density policies at the local level LPAs should seek to maximise the use of land by applying the highest density possible, consistent with maintaining local character. We agree with those who drew attention to the importance of design statements in delivering high quality schemes. However, we are satisfied that Policy P1/3 of the Plan and its supporting text, notably paragraph 1.29, adequately address this issue.
- 5.75 We note that the last sentence in paragraph 5.14, referring to the need for flexibility in applying the guidelines to very small sites, is potentially in conflict with Government policy and our recommended revised policy. It is inappropriate for the Structure Plan to set out exceptions. It will be for LPAs to decide whether there is any local justification to depart from the requirement that densities below 30dph would not be acceptable.

Monitoring

- 5.76 We were told that the present systems for monitoring are based on gross not net densities. All agree that, to accord with PPG3, monitoring will need to be carried out on the basis of net density, defined in Annex C to PPG3 as including *‘only those areas which will be developed for housing and directly associated uses’*. The SPAs indicated to us that they proposed to make this clear in the supporting text. We appreciate that tracking densities can be quite a complex exercise and commend Peterborough City Council who advised us that they look at density both at planning application stage and as built. This approach is to be recommended as it enables effective and accurate monitoring.

RECOMMENDATION 5C

¹² DETR/CABE ‘By Design – Urban design in the planning system: towards better practice’, May 2000 (CD 5.22).

Redraft Policy P5/2 as follows:

‘The average density of new housing development will need to be increased across the Structure Plan area in order to maximise efficiency in the use of sites. In setting density standards appropriate to their area Local Planning Authorities should take into account the following guidelines:

- *Densities of at least 40 dwellings per hectare should be sought in locations close to a good range of existing or potential services and facilities and where there is, or there is the potential for, good public transport accessibility.*
- *In appropriate locations in or close to the centres of Cities and Market Towns, in planned new communities, and in locations with access to high quality public transport service, significantly higher densities should be sought.*
- *Densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare will not be acceptable.*

Local Planning Authorities should seek to maximise the use of land by applying the highest density possible which is compatible with maintaining local character.’

Redraft the supporting text to reflect the revised policy and delete the last sentence in paragraph 5.14.

Make it clear in the supporting text that the densities referred to are net, as defined in Annex C of PPG3.

MEETING LOCALLY IDENTIFIED HOUSING NEED (Policy P5/4)

5.77 Policy P5/4 and paragraphs 5.15–5.20 set out the approach which should be followed by local plans in meeting locally identified housing needs. This policy covers four areas of housing need, namely:

- affordable housing,
- one and two bedroom homes,
- houses suitable for the elderly and those with disability problems,
- housing for other specific groups, including key workers, students, the homeless, travellers and gypsies.

5.78 The debate at the EIP was principally concerned with meeting the needs for affordable and key worker housing. Two other policies, namely P2/4 and P9/2, are also relevant to the issue of affordable and key worker housing and the relevant parts have therefore been dealt with in this section. Policy P2/4 deals with employment clusters and indicates that appropriate contributions will be sought from cluster businesses to facilitate provision of key worker housing. Policy P9/2 sets out the housing requirements for the Cambridge Sub-Region. It specifies that *‘30% or more of the new housing in the Sub-Region will be affordable. All housing developments will be expected to contribute to this provision. Housing and employment developments will additionally make provision for key worker housing where appropriate’*.

5.79 We deal with the main issues raised under the following five headings:

- role of the Structure Plan;

- definitions;
- targets;
- delivery;
- the role of employment development.

Role of the Structure Plan

- 5.80 All participants accepted that there was a severe shortage of affordable housing in the Structure Plan area, particularly in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Large numbers of people with jobs in Cambridge are forced out of the housing market because of high prices and this has contributed to long-distance commuting and pressure on the labour market. This is backed up by a range of evidence, including information on house prices and income levels, evidence from recent housing needs surveys (collated in SPA Supplement 14), research by the University of Cambridge¹³ and anecdotal evidence of recruitment and retention problems from employers.
- 5.81 The HBF drew the Panel's attention to paragraph 7 of Circular 6/98 and argued that affordable housing is a local, rather than strategic issue. Paragraph 7 of Circular 6/98 states that '*Structure Plans should not provide detailed guidance on the provision of affordable housing...*' (our underlining). The Circular is thus concerned with the level of detail that should be contained in the Structure Plan rather than the principle of whether the Plan ought to contain such policies.
- 5.82 The scale of identified housing need and the wider implications that this may have on the delivery of other aspects of the development strategy is such that the Panel consider this matter to be of real strategic significance which should, rightly, be addressed in the Structure Plan. Moreover, RPG6 Policies 10 and 12 place a requirement on the development plans to address the issue of affordable housing. Whilst RPG6 does not distinguish between the role of structure plans and local plans, we believe that, for consistency of application across the whole Structure Plan area, it is appropriate to include a policy relating to the provision of affordable housing in this Plan.

Definitions

- 5.83 A key issue for debate at the EIP was the distinction between the terms: affordable housing, key worker housing and low-cost market housing. The Glossary to the Structure Plan includes definitions of affordable housing and key workers.
- 5.84 Dealing first with the definition of affordable housing, Circular 6/98 (paragraph 4) indicates that: '*The terms "affordable housing" or "affordable homes" are used in this Circular to encompass both low cost market housing and subsidised housing (irrespective of tenure, ownership – whether exclusive or shared – or financial arrangements) that will be available to people who cannot afford to rent or buy houses generally available on the open market.*' The wording in paragraph 5.18 of the Plan, together with that in the Glossary, adequately reflects the definition in Circular 6/98 so we see no reason to recommend changes to the Plan in this respect.
- 5.85 Greater difficulty arises with the definition of key workers. The Glossary states that key workers are '*persons essential to the local economy, including teachers, nurses and the*

¹³ Research into Key Worker and Affordable Housing in the Cambridge Area (CD 2.10)

police, or vital personnel in leading edge firms'. A number of participants criticised this definition, particularly the latter part relating to leading edge firms. We also find the definition rather imprecise. In a policy context it would be difficult to define which jobs are 'essential' to the local economy and who are the 'vital' personnel in leading edge firms. This is further compounded when it comes to trying to define key worker housing as a category separate to affordable housing, in the terms implied in Policy P9/2.

- 5.86 One of the main drawbacks of the Glossary definition is that it encompasses both those individuals who would require a subsidy in order to house themselves and also those individuals who may not need a subsidy. For example, amongst all those employed at Addenbrooke's Hospital who fall within the category of *'persons essential to the local economy'* there are those that clearly require assistance in order to afford housing but also those whose income may well be sufficient for them to be able to meet their housing needs without help. It is not the intention of national policy to subsidise those that are capable of affording housing on the open market. This begs the question: using the definition of affordable housing in paragraph 4 of Circular 6/98, what is the difference between those generally in need of affordable housing and key workers in need of affordable housing?
- 5.87 Rather than attempting to distinguish between key workers and those in need of affordable housing generally, it would be more appropriate for the Plan to acknowledge that key workers form a sub-set of the overall affordable housing need. The specific needs of key workers (in terms of housing types, preferred tenures and locations etc) should then be addressed along with other sub-sets of affordable housing at the local level through the local housing needs assessments. Decisions about what types of affordable housing to build can then reflect local housing need (including the need for key worker housing) and individual site suitability, in accordance with paragraphs 10 and 15 of Circular 6/98. This approach would have the benefit that it would not be prone to double counting key workers and those in need of affordable housing through separate assessment processes.
- 5.88 Since it is difficult to establish an accurate and all encompassing definition of key workers and we cannot see that it serves a particularly useful purpose, we recommend that it be replaced with a definition of 'key worker housing', indicating that this is a sub-set of affordable housing targeted at specific groups such as teachers, nurses and those in the emergency services who have been priced out of the housing market.
- 5.89 The third definition which came in for scrutiny was that of 'low-cost market housing'. In a situation like Cambridge even the lowest cost housing for sale on the open market is out of reach of many low paid workers. One participant suggested that the word 'discounted' be inserted to make it clear that such housing should be sold at a discounted level to ensure its affordability. As indicated in paragraph 5.18 of the Plan, this will usually be achieved through developer contributions or some form of cross-subsidy on sites where full price market housing is built. This interpretation is backed up by a letter from the Government Office for the South East to the South Eastern Regional Assembly¹⁴, which states that *'low-cost market housing is an element of affordable housing delivered, in this case, at an agreed discount below the full market value in response to an identified need'*. Although, the terminology in Circular 6/98 refers to 'low-cost market housing', not 'discounted low-cost market housing', we consider that it would clarify the Plan to

¹⁴ Letter dated 1st October 2001, attached as Appendix 2 to the statement on EIP Issue 3D from South Cambridgeshire District Council.

include the word ‘discounted’ in paragraph 5.18 and in the revised definition in the Glossary.

- 5.90 The definition of key workers in the University report¹⁵ sets out the types and tenures of housing which will best meet the needs of key workers. This specifically excludes ‘*low cost market housing that is not discounted because the evidence suggests that such housing would not be affordable to those on moderate to low incomes*’. The change we have recommended above will help to clarify that, for the purposes of providing affordable (including key worker) housing in this Plan, low-cost market housing is only that which is discounted below the full market value to a price which would make it affordable. It follows therefore that low-cost market housing as defined in the Plan can contribute towards meeting the specific needs of low paid key workers.

Targets

- 5.91 Paragraph 5.17 of the supporting text to Policy P5/4 states that local plan targets for affordable housing are ‘*likely to be within an indicative range of 30-50%*’. Whilst future assessments of housing need may demonstrate a need within this range, we have heard nothing to convince us that this will definitely be the case throughout the whole of the Plan area. The only evidence before us is that of the targets in the extant local plans, summarised in SPA Supplement 14. The majority of the local plans currently seek around 30% affordable housing, the exceptions being East Cambridgeshire (20-30%) and Fenland (13%).
- 5.92 In the absence of a comprehensive set of recent housing needs surveys, it is conceivable that the need for affordable housing in any area may fall below the 30% or above the 50% thresholds. The Structure Plan may therefore be setting a target range for all Local Plans, which the local authorities may have no option but to depart from. Whilst the range is clearly not intended to be binding on local authorities, it adds nothing to the Plan and we see no reason for retaining it.
- 5.93 Policy P9/2 for the Cambridge Sub-Region contains an affordable housing target for the Sub-Region as a whole of 30% or more, and indicates that key worker housing should be additional to this. In view of the clear evidence of a high level of housing needs within the Sub-Region and the benefits of adopting a co-ordinated sub-regional approach to tackling this issue we fully accept the principle of including a target in the Structure Plan for this Sub-Region.
- 5.94 At the time of closing the EIP the joint housing needs survey commissioned by South Cambridgeshire, Cambridge City and East Cambridgeshire Councils had not been published. We do not, therefore, have a final, up-to-date assessment available to inform our recommendations. On the evidence from the most recent housing needs surveys and local plans, we are satisfied that the level of need is such that a target of 30% or more is fully justified.
- 5.95 However, in the light of our conclusion above, it would be inappropriate to have a target for affordable housing and then seek additional key worker housing on top of this. Since key worker housing forms a sub-set of affordable housing, a single over-arching target for both would be a more appropriate approach. The University study suggested that a figure of at least 50%, including key worker housing, was probably required. At this stage, however, we have no firm basis on which to amend the 30% target. We understand that

¹⁵ Page 6 of CD 2.10 (op. cit)

the housing needs survey is expected to provide information on the full range of affordable housing requirements, including key worker housing. The figure of 30% should therefore be reviewed in the light of the results of this survey, if possible, prior to the publication of the Modifications.

Site Threshold

- 5.96 Policy P9/2 states that *'all housing developments will be expected to contribute to this (affordable housing) provision'* (our underlining). Whilst we understand the motivation behind this requirement, it is clearly contrary to the provisions of Circular 6/98 (paragraph 10(i)) which indicates that it will not normally be appropriate to seek affordable housing provision on developments of less than 25 dwellings, or residential sites of below 1 hectare. However, the Circular does allow for a lower threshold of 15 dwellings/0.5 hectares to apply where exceptional local constraints to the supply and suitability of affordable housing can be demonstrated. Moreover, it does not preclude developers from providing affordable housing on sites which are below the size threshold *'where they think it feasible and appropriate'*.
- 5.97 We note that Policy 10 of RPG6 advises that development plans should *'consider in the Cambridge Sub-Region whether there is evidence to justify the application of lower thresholds as set out in Circular 6/98 (ie. down to developments of 15 dwellings or 0.5 hectares)'*. Whilst we are satisfied that the scale and severity of need for affordable housing in the Sub-Region fully justifies the adoption of this lower threshold, we cannot accept that the Plan should adopt such a bold departure as having no threshold whatsoever. We also have serious concerns over whether this would be workable in practice. We understand that Circular 6/98 is shortly to be reviewed by the Government, but for the moment we must conclude that the Structure Plan should comply with the current national policy guidance. If a more flexible approach is introduced before the Structure Plan is finally adopted, and the joint housing needs survey indicates that a lower threshold is justified, then this recommendation could be reviewed.

Delivery of Affordable and Key Worker Housing

- 5.98 It was put to us that the Plan should contain explicit mechanisms for the proactive delivery of affordable housing. These might include such things as enabling local plans to allocate sites solely for affordable housing and advocating the use of compulsory purchase powers to acquire land for affordable housing. Whilst we recognise that there is a high level of need for affordable housing, delivery policies such as those proposed are too detailed for the Structure Plan level. There is nothing to prevent LPAs from adopting proactive mechanisms to encourage the delivery of affordable housing either in local plans or supplementary planning guidance but the Structure Plan is not the vehicle through which these should be pursued.

The role of employment development

- 5.99 Policy P9/2 indicates the intention to seek contributions towards key worker housing from employment developments. This is also referred to in Policy P2/4 dealing with clusters, which states that *'in allocating sites suitable for new and existing employment clusters, the local planning authorities, with their partners will ... indicate appropriate contributions from cluster businesses to facilitate provision of key worker housing and public transport'*. Some participants questioned the validity and fairness of including such an approach in the Plan. The SPAs argued that in such a buoyant economy as the

Cambridge Sub-Region it was only fair that employers should help in meeting the housing needs of their employees.

- 5.100 Although there is nothing in Circular 6/98 which specifically advocates the approach in these policies, there is nothing which precludes it either. In such circumstances it is necessary to consider the overarching guidance on planning obligations in Circular 1/97. In our view, the contribution of employment development towards key worker housing complies with the five tests in paragraph 7 of the Circular. As such, we do not see any reason why such an approach should not be pursued in the Plan.
- 5.101 We heard a great deal about the need for key worker housing from two particular employers – the University of Cambridge and Addenbrooke’s Hospital. These two bodies are also singled out in the report by the University of Cambridge¹⁶ as *‘large enough employers to be involved in key worker schemes for their own employees’*. Both these institutions are also proposing large-scale releases from the Green Belt for development which includes a proportion of housing, some of which is proposed to be for their own employees. We are pleased to see these institutions taking the opportunity to meet their affordable/key worker housing needs in a sustainable manner, close to the respective employment locations. In both cases this will represent a contribution towards the overall infrastructure requirement under the terms of Policy P9/9. Additionally, as both employers own the land, they are in a position to ensure the housing is retained as affordable/key worker housing in perpetuity.

RECOMMENDATION 5D

Amend Policy P5/4 to read:

‘Local Plans should make provision to meet the locally assessed need for:-

- affordable housing, including key worker housing;***
- one and two bedroom homes;***
- housing suitable for the elderly and those with mobility problems;***
- other specific groups, including students, the homeless, travellers and gypsies.’***

Delete the words *‘although they are likely to be within an indicative range of 30-50%’* from paragraph 5.17.

Insert the word *‘discounted’* before *‘low cost market housing’* in paragraph 5.18.

Replace the third paragraph of Policy P9/2 with:

‘[30%]¹⁷ or more of the new housing in the Sub-Region will be affordable, including key worker housing. All housing developments of more than 15 dwellings or on residential sites of more than 0.5 ha. will be expected to contribute to this provision. Employment developments will also be expected to contribute towards affordable housing through developer contributions, in accordance with Policy P9/9’.

¹⁶ Paragraph 9.9, CD2.10 (op. cit).

¹⁷ The figure of 30% should be reviewed and amended in the light of the Sub-Regional Housing Needs Study.

Delete the definition of key workers from the Glossary and replace with a definition of 'key worker housing' which reads:

'A subset of affordable housing comprising discounted market housing targeted at specific groups, including teachers, nurses and others whose role relates to the care and comfort of the community, who are unable to meet their housing needs on the open market.'

CHAPTER 6

TRANSPORT

- 6.1 In this chapter we consider the transport strategy. Chapter 8 of the Plan provides, in Policies P8/1-P8/9, P8/11 and P8/12, a suite of generic policies covering the following:
- links between land use and transport (P8/1);
 - implementing sustainable transport (P8/2);
 - Area Transport Plans (P8/3);
 - managing demand for car travel (P8/4);
 - provision of parking (P8/5);
 - improvements to bus and community transport services (P8/6);
 - improvements to rail services (P8/7);
 - encouraging walking and cycling (P8/8);
 - provision of public rights of way (P8/9);
 - provision for the movement of freight, lorry parking, reserving land for rail freight interchange (P8/11);
 - air services (P8/12).
- 6.2 Specific transport priorities are set out in Policy P8/10 as they relate to the Structure Plan area as a whole and in Policies P9/10 and P10/7 which relate, respectively, to the Cambridge Sub-Region and the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area. Before we examine the suite of policies and the transport priorities we consider the overall approach of the Structure Plan to the transport strategy.

TRANSPORT STRATEGY

- 6.3 Paragraphs 8.1- 8.11 cover a number of themes including:
- the economic and environmental impact of congestion in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (paragraph 8.2);
 - the importance of linkages between land use and transport and the need for new development to address the infrastructure deficit (paragraph 8.3);
 - the role of transport in shaping the framework for sustainable development (paragraph 8.4);
 - the need to recognise the diversity of the Plan area and the challenges to provide accessibility to the facilities that people need both in the urban and the rural areas with the emphasis, specifically in the urban areas, on promoting travel by means other than the car and providing real travel choice (paragraph 8.7);
 - the importance of the availability of transport in combating social exclusion (paragraph 8.8);

- the means of integrating land use and transport planning through influencing the location, scale, density, design and mix of land uses as well as planning and providing appropriate infrastructure (paragraph 8.9).
- 6.4 Paragraph 8.6 sets out the key transport policy themes which have been established through the Local Transport Plans for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. These are to:
- develop integrated and sustainable transport;
 - promote travel choice and encourage walking, cycling and bus use;
 - improve safety;
 - maintain and operate effective transport networks.
- 6.5 Paragraph 8.10 summarises what the individual policies seek to achieve. However, there is nothing in this part of the Plan which sets out in simple terms what the overall transport strategy for the Plan area is. Moreover, we agree with those who argued that the list of schemes in Policies P8/10, P9/10 and P10/7 does not add up to a transport strategy. We believe that it is important to set out more clearly what the long term strategy is for inter-relating transport and land use development, particularly for the Cambridge Sub-Region. We touch upon this in discussing the ‘vision’ and strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region in Chapter 7.
- 6.6 Later in this chapter we are recommending that Policy P9/10, which covers the Cambridge Sub-Region, contains a statement of the strategy for that part of the Structure Plan area. We note that Policy P10/7 already contains in bullet point form a summary of the key elements of a transport strategy for Peterborough itself and for the Market Towns and Rural Areas. In our view, these policies, read together with the introductory text at the beginning of Chapter 8 of the Structure Plan summarised above, will provide a sufficiently clear approach to transport across the Structure Plan area as a whole.

LINKS BETWEEN LAND USE AND TRANSPORT (Policy P8/1)

- 6.7 Policy P8/1 sets out the criteria to be met by new development to achieve sustainable development.
- 6.8 It was suggested that this policy, the objective of which is to minimise travel and maximise the opportunity to use travel modes other than the private car, should give more emphasis to the role of high quality public transport (HQPT) in delivering sustainable development. In particular, we were asked to consider including a requirement that all strategic development sites are linked to the provision of HQPT. We conclude later in this chapter that the SPAs should develop a strategy for the provision of a HQPT network in the Cambridge Sub-Region, where the pressures for development are greatest. This would include routes in key transport corridors linking Cambridge with the Market Towns and major strategic development sites. We also recommend that consideration be given to the need for an orbital route linking strategic development sites to HQPT nodes. We recognise that HQPT has a role in delivering sustainable development in the Structure Plan area as a whole. However, as the issue of HQPT is addressed in Policies P8/6 and P8/10, which we deal with below, we see no need for a specific reference to the role of HQPT in Policy P8/1.
- 6.9 It was suggested by one participant that the policy should promote the concept of Transport Development Areas (TDAs) in areas of good public transport access. PPG13

states that these *'may provide a mechanism to help integrate development and transport objectives in highly accessible locations'*. The advice on TDAs is given in the context of encouraging LPAs to be proactive in promoting intensive development in the most accessible locations such as close to major transport interchanges. However, the advice goes on to say that *'TDAs should not be seen as an end in themselves and local planning authorities should consider whether they represent the best way to promote the objectives of this guidance in a given location'*¹. In our view, the decision to use TDAs is a matter for determination at the local level in the context of the guidance in PPG13. Further guidance would not add anything to the Plan.

- 6.10 We concur with the general agreement that the first bullet point of the policy should be changed to allow also for development in locations which *'can be made'* highly accessible to public transport. Our attention was drawn to the conflict which exists between the need for development to be highly accessible to public transport and the recognition in paragraph 1.18 of the Plan that *'there may be some instances where small-scale development may help to meet local economic and social needs of smaller settlements'*. Such development is provided for in various policies in the Plan, notably Policies P2/6, P3/4 and P5/5. We believe this conflict needs to be addressed in the Plan. However, we do not support the suggestion made by some participants that the policy should set a level of development which would trigger the need for good public transport accessibility, as it should be the aim for all development to be accessible by a range of modes other than the car, which includes public transport.
- 6.11 There will be some parts of the more remote rural area covered by the Plan where it is going to be difficult to achieve locations which are highly accessible by public transport but where, nevertheless, some additional development may be needed to sustain existing communities. Accordingly, we propose the addition of a paragraph to Policy P8/1 which recognises that, where development under Policies P2/6, P3/4 and P5/5 cannot meet the first bullet point in the policy, it should, nevertheless, be located and designed so far as possible to meet the remaining bullet points.
- 6.12 Finally, we are recommending a few further, essentially cosmetic, changes to the policy which are intended to better reflect its role as a strategic guide and not a development control tool.

RECOMMENDATION 6A

Redraft Policy P8/1 as follows:

'Local Planning Authorities should include policies in their Local Plans to ensure that new development:

- ***is located in areas that are, or can be made, highly accessible to public transport, cycle and on foot;***
- ***is designed to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car;***
- ***provides opportunities for travel choice;***
- ***provides for the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users;***

¹ Footnote 9 to paragraph 21 of PPG13 Transport.

- *provides appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety.*

In rural areas there may be instances where small-scale development, which is provided for under Policies P2/6, P3/4 and P5/5, is unable to be located in an area which is or can be made highly accessible to public transport. In such circumstances developments should be located and designed so far as possible to meet the remaining requirements of this policy.'

IMPLEMENTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT (Policy P8/2)

- 6.13 Policy P8/2 addresses the need for new development to contribute to the provision of transport infrastructure and requires that Travel Plans accompany new non-residential development.
- 6.14 We agree with the suggestion that the use of the word 'in' in the title of this policy is misleading. It suggests that the policy is concerned solely with the provision of transport infrastructure within new developments when it is intended to ensure that new development contributes to the provision of integrated transport systems both within and beyond site boundaries. To that end we support the replacement of the word 'in' with the word 'for' in the title.
- 6.15 Additional wording was proposed by one participant which would have the effect of making the provision of financial contributions an alternative to direct improvements to transport networks and make all transport infrastructure provision dependent on the test '*where these have been shown to satisfactorily mitigate the impact of that development*'. Policy P6/1 is the foundation policy for development-related provision and it seems to us that there is no need for Policy P8/2 to include the mechanisms which are covered in P6/1. Thus, we see the words in Policy P8/2 '*through financial contributions and direct improvements to transport networks*' to be unnecessary.
- 6.16 The precise requirements which will need to be sought in relation to specific development proposals to meet the objective of Policy P8/2 will be a matter for determination at the local level either through local plan policies, masterplans or at the development control stage, depending on the scale of the development. This would include whether contributions are required to a particular HQPT route and whether any highway improvements are required in relation to a particular scheme. None of these matters need to be addressed at the strategic level. However, it would be helpful to insert a cross-reference to Policy P6/1 at the end of paragraph 8.14.

RECOMMENDATION 6B

Replace the word 'in' with the word 'for' in the title of Policy P8/2 and delete the words '*through financial contributions and direct improvements to transport networks*' from the policy.

Add at the end of paragraph 8.14 '*Policy P6/1 deals with development related provision*'.

AREA TRANSPORT PLANS (Policy P8/3)

- 6.17 Policy P8/3 requires Area Transport Plans to be developed for Cambridge, Peterborough and the Market Towns, together with their surrounding areas.
- 6.18 Area Transport Plans provide one of the mechanisms for identifying the infrastructure requirements which will need to be addressed by individual developments in order to meet the objective of Policy P8/2 to deliver an *'integrated and improved transport infrastructure'*. We were referred to the two Area Transport Plans which Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City have developed for the southern and eastern corridors. The purpose of these Plans is to:
- i. identify new transport infrastructure and service provision that is needed to facilitate large scale development in the south (and in the east) of Cambridge;*
 - ii. identify a fair and robust means of calculating how individual development sites in the area should contribute to the fulfilment of that transport infrastructure.*²
- 6.19 Each Plan sets out in detail the schemes to be secured by contributions. These total £8,400,000 in the southern corridor and £5,170,000 in the eastern corridor. In each case the Plans set a level of contribution which will be required from developers in order *'to bring about the required additional transport capacity in the area'*. In the case of the southern corridor the figure is £369 per generated trip and in the case of the eastern corridor it is £229. By July 2002 a total of £3,490,000 had been collected in relation to schemes in the southern corridor and £608,000 in the eastern corridor³. In our view these Plans are a very good demonstration of the effectiveness of the Area Transport Plan approach which is being promoted under Policy P8/3. They may also provide a precedent for the collection of developer contributions to fund infrastructure across the Cambridge Sub Region as a whole (see Chapter 3).
- 6.20 We were asked to consider whether such plans should seek to encourage schemes which place a greater reliance on the use of slow modes and public transport by differentiating between the amount of funding sought from those schemes as opposed to schemes which are more car reliant. In our view, the precise methodology used for the collection of funds and any exemptions to be included in any Area Transport Plans produced under Policy P8/3 is a matter for determination at the local level. We are satisfied that there is sufficient advice in both PPG13 and elsewhere in the Structure Plan to discourage car reliance and promote alternative modes of transport. Applying any levy just to the generation of car trips would ignore the need for funding to provide the services and facilities needed to support the increased use of public transport and increased walking and cycling, such as:
- bus stops and segregated bus lanes and, in rural areas, the provision of community bus services;
 - segregated footways/cycleways and controlled road crossing points.
- 6.21 We agree with the SPAs that Policy P8/3 should not specify the areas or corridors for which Area Transport Plans should be prepared. Again, it is a matter for the local authorities to determine in which corridors this approach will be most appropriate, having regard to the scale and nature of the development proposed within that corridor or area. In this context, we have referred in Chapter 8 to the fact that Cambridge City suggest the

² Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan and Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan (CD2.20.1).

³ Paragraphs 3.5 and 3.12 (CD2.20.1).

use of the Area Transport Plan approach to address the transportation issues arising from the proposed release of Green Belt land in the north-west sector of the city.

- 6.22 We conclude that no change is needed to Policy P8/3. We note, however, that the SPAs have responded to those who suggested that Area Transport Plans should be the subject of public consultation by suggesting a change to paragraph 8.18 of the Plan. We support this change.

RECOMMENDATION 6C

No change to Policy P8/3.

Insert after the third sentence in paragraph 8.18: *‘This process will include extensive public consultation as part of the Area Transport Plan development’.*

MANAGING DEMAND FOR CAR TRAVEL (Policy P8/4)

- 6.23 Policy P8/4 requires LPAs to introduce appropriate measures to manage the demand for car travel and sets out the type of measures to be used.
- 6.24 This is an important policy for the whole of the Structure Plan area. However, it is particularly so in relation to the Cambridge Sub-Region where the success of the strategy is dependent to a large degree on the ability of the local authorities to control congestion, notably on the radial routes into the City centre and within the centre itself. The CHUMMS study final report⁴ refers to *‘the County Council’s target of stabilising traffic levels entering the City at current levels’*. The report goes on to say that *‘In order to achieve this target the County Council recognises the need to continue its policy on restricting access to the city centre by car ... by continuing to implement, and indeed strengthening, some form of demand management’*.
- 6.25 Much of the discussion focussed on the issue of fiscal measures and whether the Structure Plan should specify that these should include congestion charging. The CHUMMS report records the fact the County Council prefer a workplace levy rather than road pricing and we were reminded by the SPAs at the EIP that congestion charging is an emerging technology. We note that the modelling for the CHUMMS study included a notional charge of £3.00 per vehicle entering Cambridge *‘to synthesise future demand management measures’*. This had the effect of reducing the numbers of cars entering Cambridge by some 30%⁵, bringing the numbers of cars down to 20% below current levels, ie in excess of what is required to meet the County Council’s target. The package of measures recommended by CHUMMS does not include congestion charging as one of the methods of managing demand.
- 6.26 We believe that it is neither necessary nor appropriate for the Plan to specify the precise demand management measures which will be needed for different parts of the Structure Plan area. However, we agree with those participants who suggested that the Plan should indicate how critical demand management is to the success of the Cambridge Sub-

⁴ Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi-Modal Study Final Report (CD2.15)

⁵ This figure is taken from the CHUMMS Study document but we understand that the correct figure should be 36%.

Regional strategy. It is likely that all of the measures referred to in Policy P8/4 will be needed to ensure that the major development proposed for the City does not lead to greater congestion and the failure of the proposed rapid transit system and other public transport measures to deliver reliable, fast and frequent access into and across the city. This needs to be made clear in the policy and the text. The text should also state that the Local Transport Plan will consider the range of measures to be applied, including examining the need for fiscal measures such as workplace parking charges and/or congestion charging.

- 6.27 The issue of hypothecation of any funds raised was discussed. We were advised by GO-East that hypothecation for a period of 10 years was permissible. We support the principle that monies raised as a result of any form of charging should be used for improvements to the transport infrastructure in the relevant part of the Structure Plan area. However, we agree with the SPAs that the purpose of demand management is not to raise money but to restrict car movements. The question of how any monies raised are used is a matter which is more properly addressed under the Local Transport Plan process through which the precise measures will be delivered.
- 6.28 We have considered whether it is sufficiently clear that the policy applies to what might be described as the wider Cambridge area ie all routes that are affected by the congestion caused by those wishing to enter the city. We are satisfied that the policy is sufficiently clear and would enable demand management measures to be applied to routes into as well as within the city.
- 6.29 There was some discussion about the need for the re-allocation of roadspace used for on-street parking to reduce the parking capacity in the city centre. The City Council and South Cambridgeshire expressed their concern that the role of Cambridge as a regional and local centre should not be undermined by making it too unattractive for shoppers. There is clearly a balance to be struck between the demand management measures taken to reduce congestion and the need to protect the vitality and function of the city centre. It is not for the Structure Plan to strike that balance as it can only be done at the local level. There is nothing to be gained by the Structure Plan determining the precise nature of the various demand management measures which are indicated in general terms in Policy P8/4.
- 6.30 Finally, we agree with the suggestion that this policy should relate to '*Local Authorities*' rather than '*Local Planning Authorities*' as it is the role of the Local Highway Authority to prepare the Local Transport Plan and to implement the measures contained therein.

RECOMMENDATION 6D

Delete the word '*Planning*' from the first line of Policy P8/4 and replace the word '*may*' with '*are likely to*' after '*measures*'.

Add the following paragraph to the supporting text to follow paragraph 8.19:

'Demand management is critical to the success of the strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region and it is likely that all of the measures in Policy P8/4 will be required. The Local Transport Plan will examine the range of measures necessary to ensure that the major development proposed for Cambridge does not lead to greater congestion and to the failure of the proposed rapid transit system and other public transport measures to deliver reliable,

fast and frequent access into and across the city. This will include examining the need for fiscal measures such as workplace parking charges and/or congestion charging.'

PROVISION OF PARKING (Policy P8/5)

- 6.31 Policy P8/5 requires all parking standards to be expressed as maximum standards and identifies circumstances where lower levels may be required. It also requires non-residential parking standards in Cambridge, Peterborough and the Market Towns not to exceed the standards in PPG13.
- 6.32 There was some concern that the policy:
- is too prescriptive;
 - might discourage development at transport nodes;
 - should reflect a need for parking at railway stations to encourage sustainable travel;
 - appears to relate PPG13 standards primarily to urban areas.
- 6.33 As to whether the policy is too prescriptive, it has its foundation in PPG13 which states that *'Reducing the amount of parking in new development ... is essential as part of a package of planning and transport measures to promote sustainable travel choices'*⁶. In our view, Policy P8/5 is in general accord with the advice in PPG13 and there is no local justification for departing from this.
- 6.34 On the second matter, the first bullet point in the policy implies that development at or close to transport nodes may be required to have lower levels of parking. We recognise the argument, reflected in PPG13, that parking policies should not lead to pressure to develop in locations where more favourable parking standards might prevail. However, we do not see that the policy would result in such perverse incentives. Other policies in the Plan, such as Policy P5/3, seek to encourage higher densities in locations with good accessibility by a range of travel modes. In order to deliver higher densities in such locations it will be necessary to maximise the use of land and minimise potentially wasteful uses such as parking. Nevertheless, the policy is not prescriptive and it will be for the LPAs to assess in the particular circumstances of their areas where such lower standards might be appropriate, in the light of the guidance in PPG13. There is no need to amend the policy.
- 6.35 On the third matter, we were advised by the SPAs that the Peterborough Local Transport Plan exempts the railway station from parking standards. Whether or not such exemptions should apply elsewhere is a matter which should be properly determined at the local level on the basis of the particular circumstances of the station or other transport node. Paragraph 63 of PPG13 recognises that a conflict exists between increasing the potential catchment population for rail services by providing parking at railway stations and exacerbating road congestion. Thus, it would be unwise for the Structure Plan to seek to provide separately for parking at railway stations.
- 6.36 There was general agreement with the concept of 'Link and Ride' schemes to encourage shorter car journeys by providing parking at locations which will enable journeys to various destinations to be undertaken by modes other than the car. Policy P8/10 makes

⁶ Paragraph 49 PPG13 'Transport'

provision for interchanges and park and ride schemes and our suggested changes to that policy should provide an appropriate policy framework for the LPAs to develop suitable schemes within their areas.

- 6.37 As to the reference to non residential parking standards in the last paragraph of the policy we agree that this should apply to the whole of the Structure Plan area and not just to the urban areas. However, in relation to Cambridge, Peterborough and the Market Towns we support the additional text the SPAs suggested which recognises the need to encourage lower parking standards to be applied where shared parking is available. Thus, we are recommending a reordering of the last paragraph of this policy.

RECOMMENDATION 6E

Redraft the last paragraph of Policy P8/5 as follows:

‘Parking standards for non-residential development should not exceed the standards specified in PPG13. In Cambridge, Peterborough and the Market Towns parking standards for non-residential development below PPG13 standards should be achieved where shared parking is possible.’

IMPROVING BUS AND COMMUNITY TRANSPORT SERVICES (Policy P8/6)

- 6.38 Policy P8/6 requires the identification and development of High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) services across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, good services for market towns and feeder services linking rural areas to urban centres and community transport to meet social needs in rural areas.
- 6.39 This policy generated a good deal of discussion which raised essentially two main issues:
- whether the policy provides a sufficiently clear distinction between HQPT and other bus and community transport services;
 - whether the definition of HQPT is sufficiently comprehensive.

Following the discussion the SPAs produced revised wording (SPA Supplement 21), which simplifies and clarifies the policy. This includes deleting the words ‘*in rural areas*’ from the last bullet point which relates to community transport in recognition of the fact that meeting social needs by this means need not be limited to rural areas. This was generally supported by participants and we agree with this change.

- 6.40 The policy as set out in the Plan is confusing as it seems to imply that HQPT services include both ‘good services for market towns’ and ‘community transport to meet social needs’. The redrafted policy proposed by the SPAs overcomes this problem by revising the introduction to the policy and treating HQPT as a separate topic. We see no particular advantage in putting HQPT into a separate policy as suggested to us. HQPT should be seen as part of a package of public transport measures and not as a separate entity. A separate policy might, indeed, suggest that HQPT, which is essentially related to the main urban areas and to the links between them, should be treated differently from the provision of other types of public transport which are required to serve the wider area and which are of equal importance.

- 6.41 However, as we explain in greater detail under transport priorities below, we agree with the need to make it clear in the policy that the provision of HQPT should not be limited to one or two services on selected routes but should develop into a network of services. The aim should be to benefit both those living and working in the main urban areas and, by means of appropriate interchanges with other types of services, those in the more remote parts of the Structure Plan area. The issue of interchanges is addressed in Policy P8/10 and the revised wording of Policy P8/6 in Supplement 21 deals with the network point by requiring a 'network of High Quality Public Transport Services' (our underlining).
- 6.42 A question was raised about the appropriateness of the phrase '*with segregated lanes and bus priorities where required to avoid congestion*' in relation to the provision of '*high frequency, direct services*', on the basis that some of the radial routes do not have the road space to permit such segregation. We accept that road space may not always permit the provision of segregated lanes. In our view, this can be reflected by the policy referring to segregated lanes and/or bus priorities. This will not weaken the policy but will make it clear that both solutions may not always be either necessary or possible.
- 6.43 It was also suggested that the priority measures referred to for Cambridge and Peterborough are not needed just on the urban network. We agree that there may be locations on the rural network where it is both necessary and possible to give priority to buses to ensure that 'good' services can be maintained. This might include, for example, some form of priority for buses at junctions onto main roads where traffic levels are high. On that basis, we propose that the policy refers to the possible need for priority in relation to '*good local services for market towns*'.
- 6.44 As to the definition of HQPT, the SPAs provided revised wording in Supplement 21 which gives a more comprehensive definition of HQPT. We support this change. We were also asked by one participant to consider amending the word 'provides' to 'achieves'. Whilst we appreciate the distinction, we do not think that this is a necessary change. Any service which was designed to meet a particular frequency and which consistently failed to meet that frequency would not constitute a HQPT service within the context of the definition, irrespective of whether the word used is 'provides' or 'achieves'. We suggest that, for clarity, rather than simply using an asterix to draw attention to the definition the policy wording states '*(as defined below)*'.
- 6.45 We note that the proposed definition of a HQPT service states that '*During evenings and weekends, lower frequencies are likely to prevail*'. In our view, it is unsatisfactory for the definition to be so vague about what will constitute a HQPT service during evenings and weekends when people may wish to use it, for example, for leisure or shopping trips. Accordingly, we recommend that the SPAs formulate a minimum level of service for evenings and weekends.

RECOMMENDATION 6F

Redraft Policy P8/6 as follows:

'Public transport services will be identified in bus strategies and developed across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Key elements will include:

- ***A network of High Quality Public Transport Services (as defined below):***
 - ***within the urban areas of Cambridge and Peterborough, with priority over other motor traffic;***

- *as high frequency, direct services concentrated on main corridors between the Cities and the Market Towns, with segregated lanes and/or bus priorities where required to avoid congestion.*
- *Good local services for market towns and feeder services linking rural areas to urban centres. Where necessary and possible, appropriate measures should be provided to ensure that such services have priority over other motor traffic.*
- *Community transport to meet social needs.*

New development will be designed to maximise accessibility by bus and will be required to contribute towards these elements.'

And include the definition of HQPT set out in SPA Supplement 21 but with a minimum level of service specified for evenings and weekends.

IMPROVEMENTS TO RAIL SERVICES (Policy P8/7)

- 6.46 Policy P8/7 seeks to increase rail use by passengers and freight by encouraging the development of service enhancements and new infrastructure, giving priority to developments which will effect a significant transfer from road based travel.
- 6.47 In response to a suggestion that disused railway routes should be protected as they could be brought back into use for transport purposes, the SPAs propose additional text to be inserted into paragraph 8.30. In our view, the need to protect these routes is of sufficient importance that it should be included in the policy and not simply form part of the supporting text. Our view is reinforced by the advice in PPG13 which states, albeit in relation to freight, that '*local authorities should identify and, where appropriate, protect*' existing and potential routes '*which would be critical in developing infrastructure for the movement of freight*'.⁷ We see merit in referring to this in the context of Policy P8/7 rather than Policy P8/11 which deals with freight, as the protection of former rail routes would enable their use as transport corridors more generally. Accordingly, we are recommending some additional text for Policy P8/7.

RECOMMENDATION 6G

Insert at the end of Policy P8/7 the following: '*Former rail routes with the potential for re-use as transport corridors will be identified in Local Plans and protected.*'

ENCOURAGING WALKING AND CYCLING (Policy P8/8)

- 6.48 Policy P8/8 seeks to promote use of walking and cycling routes and requires all new development to provide safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle environments.
- 6.49 Sustrans suggested that the Plan ought to include targets for cycle use from major developments, such as the proposed new settlement and other strategic developments. All participants supported the intention behind these. However, we agree with the majority

⁷ Paragraph 45 PPG13 'Transport'

who felt that this was too detailed a matter for the Structure Plan and was an issue to be addressed in Masterplans and through Local Transport Plans. We note, for example, that the Peterborough Local Transport Plan sets targets for both cycling and walking, although these are much lower than those referred to by Sustrans.

- 6.50 Our attention was drawn to the Key Indicators set out in Chapter 11 of the Plan at Table 11.1 and, in particular, to Indicator 22 which refers to *‘traffic growth and modal split in Cambridge, central Peterborough and market towns measured annually across imaginary screen lines and compared to previous years’*. This indicator is cross-referred to the fourth strategic objective of the Plan which is ‘Performance of development’⁸. This objective identifies Policy P8/8 as one of the policies which are intended to meet this objective. We note, however, that whilst this objective seeks to provide ‘safe walking and cycling’ it does not seek to ‘achieve an increase in walking and cycling’. We suggest that the SPAs consider amending the objectives to incorporate this wording in order to link this group of strategic objectives more closely with both Policy P8/8 and with Indicator 22. Such an objective, taken together with any targets set in Local Transport Plans or in Masterplans for individual major developments, would, in our view, be sufficient to address the issue of targets.
- 6.51 In relation to Countryside Enhancement Areas the SPAs suggested that the following might usefully be added to paragraph 8.34: *‘The enhancement of walking and cycling routes to and from and within Countryside Enhancement Areas is vital to the enjoyment of those areas’*. We support the insertion of this text.

RECOMMENDATION 6H

No change to Policy P8/8.

Add the following sentence to paragraph 8.34: *‘In addition, the enhancement of walking and cycling routes to and from and within Countryside Enhancement Areas is vital to the enjoyment of those areas’*.

SPAs to consider including the following under Strategic Objective 4 ‘Performance of development’: *‘achieve an increase in walking and cycling’*.

PROVISION OF PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY (Policy P8/9)

- 6.52 Policy P8/9 seeks to encourage the use of the public rights network and sets out the means by which this will be achieved.
- 6.53 The SPAs suggest adding Countryside Enhancement Areas to the third bullet point in this policy, which would be consistent with the insertion of the additional text we refer to above.

⁸ Set out on page 8 of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION 6I

Insert at the end of the third bullet point in Policy P8/9: ‘*and to Countryside Enhancement Areas*’.

MOVEMENT OF FREIGHT (Policy P8/11)

- 6.54 Policy P8/11 seeks to encourage the transfer of freight from road to rail or water. It identifies Alconbury Airfield as *‘suitable for a major rail facility’*, requires the protection of rail depots and private sidings and the identification of sites for transshipment depots and lorry parks, where there is an identified need.
- 6.55 The most controversial aspect of this policy is the identification of Alconbury. It was argued that there is no strategic need for such a facility and, even if there is, this is not the right location as it is too close to the east coast ports for economic rail haul and not particularly well related to centres of manufacturing. Policy 30 of RPG6 requires development plans to *‘identify and protect, where appropriate, existing and potential sites and facilities for rail ... freight’*. This is the only site which the SPAs have identified at this stage as they have been unable to bring the local authorities and Railtrack together to discuss further options.
- 6.56 We have referred in Chapter 4 to the uncertainty which exists over the future of Alconbury Airfield. We have indicated that we are content to leave the location in Policy P2/3 as a Strategic Employment Location, as it merely continues the current policy approach pending the outcome of the current planning appeal. In the case of Policy P8/11, however, we can find nothing in the current Structure Plan about the suitability of Alconbury as a major rail facility.
- 6.57 In stating that *‘Land at Alconbury Airfield is suitable for a major rail facility’* (our underlining) the policy is very specific. We note that Railtrack are working with the Strategic Rail Authority in relation to the upgrade of the East Coast line, which we understand could serve Alconbury. However, we refer later in this chapter to the level of uncertainty that surrounds all future rail investment at present. The future of the Airfield is clearly of strategic importance and we are aware of the national target for more freight to be carried by rail. However, because of the uncertainty over the future of this location, we consider that it is premature for the Plan to take such a specific policy stance. In our view, at this stage the Plan should do no more than indicate that it may be suitable as a major rail facility and this should be referred to in the text at paragraph 8.42 and not in the policy itself. All of the relevant issues about the suitability of the location can be addressed through the Local Plan and Local Transport Plan processes once a decision on the current appeal has emerged from the First Secretary of State.
- 6.58 Meanwhile, we are satisfied that the third paragraph in the policy which requires *‘rail depots and private rail sidings to be protected in Local Plans’* should ensure that any existing used or disused facilities will be preserved for potential future use. Their importance might usefully be highlighted by adding the words *‘are of particular importance to the delivery of modal shift of freight transport from road to rail and they’* after *‘interchange sites’* in paragraph 8.42 of the Plan.
- 6.59 It was suggested that the policy might refer to the establishment of a county-wide freight partnership. We were told that a Cambridgeshire Freight Quality Partnership currently

exists although it is not operating at present. Although it is not necessary to amend the policy, we suggest that a reference in the text of the Plan to the use of Freight Quality Partnerships as a means of delivering freight modal shift would be helpful.

- 6.60 Our attention was drawn to a proposal by the Inland Waterways Association to develop a new ship canal to an inland terminal near Corby which, it is argued, would remove freight traffic from the A14. We were advised by the SPAs that a study had been carried out by the Cambridgeshire County Council and the Environment Agency which looked at the possibility of bringing freight through to Peterborough by water. This concluded that there were engineering difficulties with such a scheme, hence the comment in paragraph 8.43 of the Plan that *'the potential for transfer of freight to water is limited'*.
- 6.61 It is clear that any proposals by the Inland Waterways Association for such a canal are at a very early stage and we note that the SPAs say that any such scheme would be likely to fall outside this Structure Plan period. Thus, it would not be appropriate to put any reference to an inland port in the Plan. However, it might be helpful if the Plan were to be a little less unequivocal about the potential for transfer of freight to water by saying that this *'appears to be limited'*. We also suggest that the last part of paragraph 8.43 be reworded as a separate sentence to say *'Any feasibility studies investigating the potential for achieving a route for freight to Peterborough using the River Nene and associated waterways will also be encouraged.'* This would reflect and give support to what we understand to be the current position of those interested in such a scheme.
- 6.62 A number of other detailed wording changes which were suggested to us would not add anything to the Plan or make the policy any clearer.

RECOMMENDATION 6J

Amend Policy P8/11 by deleting *'Land at Alconbury Airfield, identified in Policy P2/3, is suitable for a major rail facility'* and transferring this wording to the supporting text at the end of paragraph 8.42, with the word *'is'* deleted and replaced by the words *'may be'*.

Insert *'are of particular importance to the delivery of modal shift of freight transport from road to rail and they'* after *'interchange sites'* to paragraph 8.42 of the Plan.

Delete the word *'is'* in the first line of paragraph 8.43 and replace with *'appears to be'*.

Put a full stop after *'Wisbech'* in paragraph 8.43 and replace the remaining text with the following: *'Any feasibility studies investigating the potential for achieving a route for freight to Peterborough using the River Nene and associated waterways will also be encouraged.'*

Insert the following as a new paragraph after paragraph 8.43: *'Freight Quality Partnerships are a useful tool in delivering freight modal shift. The Cambridgeshire Freight Quality Partnership exists but is not currently operating.'*

AIR SERVICES (Policy P8/12)

- 6.63 Policy P8/12 is a holding policy which merely records that fact that *'the need for additional airport capacity is being investigated'* and that *'if a requirement is identified a suitable location will be sought'*.
- 6.64 Since the preparation of the Plan the national position on air services has moved on, with the publication of the consultation document 'The Future Development of Air Transport in the United Kingdom: South East'⁹. This states that *'Alongside looking for a major new airport site, the detailed study of potential new airport sites identified Alconbury near Huntingdon as a prospective small scale development'* (paragraph 12.19). Associated with this is the need to find an alternative location for Cambridge Airport, a matter we return to in Chapter 8 in relation to the release of Green Belt land for development. The above consultation document assumes that Alconbury might accommodate air freight provision, low cost passenger operations and an aircraft maintenance facility equivalent in size to that at Marshall Aerospace Cambridge (paragraphs 12.20 and 12.22). In addition, a study undertaken on behalf of Marshalls and EEDA identified Alconbury as one of the options for the relocation of their businesses¹⁰. Both of these matters are controversial and the consultation period on the Air Transport document has been extended to July 2003. It seems unlikely that there will be a resolution to these issues in the form of the publication of a White Paper before the Modifications to the Structure Plan are produced.
- 6.65 Nevertheless, the SPAs propose to replace the existing Policy P8/12 with a criteria-based approach which is intended to guide any additional airport capacity required for Cambridgeshire (SPA Supplement 30). The proposed policy would say *'If any additional airport capacity is confirmed for Cambridgeshire in the Air Transport White Paper any such development will:'* and it goes on to set out criteria covering the following:
- noise and disturbance particularly in relation to night-time flying operations;
 - transport infrastructure;
 - economic impact and urbanisation requirements;
 - possible relocation of aerospace activity from Cambridge Airport;
 - subject to capacity constraints and other environmental considerations, provide for a level of passenger, freight and other services identified in the White Paper.¹¹
- 6.66 There were mixed views as to the appropriateness of such a policy and the need for the Structure Plan to include any form of policy at this stage. We appreciate the wish of the SPAs to avoid a policy vacuum. However, the policy vacuum is not of the SPAs' making and filling it with a criteria-based policy at this stage seems to us to be premature. Whatever the outcome of the current consultation exercise we would expect an issue of this regional/sub-regional significance to be addressed in RPG14. In our view, it would be appropriate to await that process before formulating a specific policy for the delivery of any additional airport capacity which may be required.
- 6.67 Whilst we are fully aware of the importance of the relocation of the current airport facilities to the delivery of the strategy for Cambridge Sub-Region, a number of options remain open to Marshalls. They are not dependent on the availability of Alconbury as an

⁹ CD4.7

¹⁰ See Chapter 8 of this Report 'Cambridge Airport'

¹¹ Full policy is set out in SPA Supplement 30.

alternative airport facility. In our view, including a policy in the Plan will not add certainty to the relocation of Marshalls and the consequent release of Cambridge Airport for development.

- 6.68 Accordingly, at this stage, we see no real advantage in the Structure Plan seeking to address the issue of air services through a specific policy. We recommend instead that the text sets out the current situation and the issues which are likely to be relevant to the provision of any future additional airport capacity for the Region or Sub-Region within this Structure Plan area. The wording we suggest below is based on those items listed as the criteria in the SPAs' proposed policy. This may help to inform the consideration of airport issues in RPG14.

RECOMMENDATION 6K

Delete Policy P8/12 and paragraph 8.44 and replace the paragraph with the following:

'The Government have produced a document 'The Future of Air Transport in the United Kingdom: South East' which considers Alconbury Airfield as a possible site to provide a substantial dedicated air freight provision, an express parcel hub, third party aircraft maintenance and low cost passenger operations. It also assumes an aircraft maintenance facility equivalent in size to that at Marshall Aerospace Cambridge. This document is the subject of consultation until July 2003 following which an Air Transport White Paper will be produced. This will determine whether a regional airport facility will be required for the Plan area. The issues likely to be relevant to the consideration of the location of any such airport are:

- *the impact of noise and/or disturbance on residents with particular reference to night-time flying;*
- *the need for transport infrastructure improvements and services related to the generation of trips to and from any such facility and the need to minimise the use of the private car for such trips by providing high quality public transport access;*
- *the ability of the local area to accommodate the economic impact;*
- *environmental issues including any urbanising impact;*
- *the potential to accommodate the relocation of the aerospace activity at Cambridge Airport, if required.'*

TRANSPORT PRIORITIES

- 6.69 The transport strategy and priorities are contained in three inter-related policies in the Plan. Policy P8/10 sets out the strategic requirements across the Structure Plan area as a whole by different transport modes. Policies P9/10 and P10/7 set out the transport strategies for the Cambridge Sub-Region and Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area respectively, by linking key transport requirements with the development proposals in each area. There is a great deal of duplication and overlap between P8/10 and the other two policies, and between these three policies and the generic transport policies in the rest of Chapter 6. Ideally, we should have liked to see some rationalisation of the policies to eliminate this overlap so that, read together, they provided a more coherent and simple summary of the transport strategy and the key infrastructure priorities. However, since it

seemed to be generally accepted that all the policies were needed in order to provide a comprehensive picture of the Structure Plan's intentions, we are not recommending a radical re-vamp of the policies, although the SPAs may wish to re-look at this part of the Plan before they publish their Modifications.

Transport Investment Priorities (Policy P8/10)

- 6.70 Policy P8/10 lists the transport schemes needed over the Structure Plan period in order to meet strategic requirements and the needs of major developments. It does so under the headings of: Rapid Transit, Multi-Modal Studies, Buses, Rail, Cycling and Walking, Interchanges, Local Roads and Trunk Roads.
- 6.71 This makes for a rather long and complex policy, containing some local schemes which fall directly within the responsibility of the LPAs, notably Cambridgeshire County Council, and others which serve a wider national or regional purpose and which will be funded mainly by central government via the Highways Agency and Strategic Rail Authority. Although it was suggested that it would be better to distinguish between these two categories by splitting the policy between national schemes and local ones we agree with the SPAs that the national schemes, notably the CHUMMS proposals for the A14, also have an important local strategic dimension. Since this is a comprehensive strategy for the Structure Plan area as a whole we agree that it is appropriate for the policy to include all the priority schemes, irrespective of the source of funding or the fact that they may also serve a wider national or regional function.
- 6.72 Similarly, we cannot see that there is any particular value in seeking to draw a distinction between schemes that are financially committed and those about which there is an element of doubt as to timing and funding. There would be problems in deciding what fully committed means and, given that the Plan looks forward 15 years, the circumstances of particular schemes are likely to change so that any such distinction would quickly become out-dated. The important thing is that the policy sets out a package of schemes the deliverability of which is being sought within the Plan period.
- 6.73 We now go on to deal with the specific sub-headings within the policy.

Rapid Transit System

- 6.74 A key element in the transport strategy is the implementation of the Rapid Transit System from Cambridge to Huntingdon utilising the former St. Ives railway line and extending south from Cambridge city centre to Trumpington. The Rapid Transit System will take the form of a guided bus route on a dedicated guideway between St. Ives and Cambridge with stops at various nodes along the route, including Longstanton/Oakington, the Science Park and Arbury Camp. Through the city it will travel on existing roads using traffic priority measures, with stops at Shire Hall, the city centre and Cambridge station and will then continue to Addenbrooke's Hospital and Trumpington, mainly on a separate guideway.
- 6.75 Although the Rapid Transit System is regarded as the driver and cornerstone for the provision of a high quality public transport system for the Cambridge Sub-Region and a critical component for the development strategy, notably the new settlement, we do not think there is anything to be gained by plucking it out of Policies P8/10 and P9/10 and giving it a policy of its own, as suggested by SuperCam (the Consortium promoting the scheme). Indeed, by detaching it from the main transport proposals this could detract from its role as a key element of a high quality public transport network for the area as a

whole. The fact that it is listed as the first scheme in the priorities in Policy P8/10 gives it the prominence it merits.

- 6.76 A specific concern highlighted by some participants arises from the depiction of the Rapid Transit System on the Structure Plan Key Diagram. This shows a secondary route for the guided bus running into the centre of Cambridge alongside the Cambridge-Ely railway line whereas the initial proposal, as indicated above, is that it should use existing roads to penetrate the city centre. The Strategic Rail Authority indicated that there were difficulties with a route running parallel to the railway line for various engineering and capacity reasons. However, the SPAs said that they had not yet ruled out a route close to the railway line, as well as the ones using roads and they were hopeful that the technical obstacles to this could be overcome. Bearing in mind the timescale of the Plan, during which rail circumstances may change, and that the lines shown on the map are highly diagrammatic anyway, we see no reason to change the Key Diagram at this stage.
- 6.77 A number of participants were not satisfied that a guided bus system is the most effective means of providing a public transport system in the A14 corridor. Some felt that a heavy rail or tram-based system would be preferable in terms of capacity, comfort and image. Others said that a route along, or parallel to, the A14 would be more effective in relieving congestion. These were fully investigated by the Cambridge-Huntingdon Multi-Modal Study (CHUMMS) and the Government has now indicated its support for the guided bus system in its endorsement of the CHUMMS package. The costs and benefits of alternative options have also been examined as part of the County Council's bid for funding in its Local Transport Plan Annex E submission. Nothing we heard at the EIP persuaded us that the choice of a guided bus system along the former railway line was wrong and we can see no value in revisiting the decision at this advanced stage.
- 6.78 We do, however, appreciate the concern of those who expressed doubts about the effect on the speed, reliability and attractiveness of a system which relies on busy roads and a heavily congested bus station to penetrate the city centre. The SPAs explained that the plans did not involve dedicated bus lanes through the city but selected bus priorities at junctions and short stretches of bus lanes intended to provide a clear comparative advantage over the car. Problems of congestion at Drummer Street bus station and at the railway station were also being investigated and the LPAs said they were confident that solutions could be found.
- 6.79 Clearly, these are issues which can only be resolved in a more detailed planning context than the Structure Plan, but the Panel wish to stress from a strategic point of view how vital it is that the effectiveness of the Rapid Transit System, as well as later elements of a high quality public transport network, are not impeded by a failure to address the issue of demand management and traffic management within the city (see our proposed changes to Policy P8/4 previously and to Policy P9/10 below).

Multi-Modal Studies

- 6.80 Since the publication of the Structure Plan the position on the CHUMMS proposals has firmed up. As indicated above, and in Chapter 3, the preferred CHUMMS plan has now been endorsed by Government and the various elements are being worked up by Cambridgeshire County Council (in respect of the Rapid Transit System and other integrated local transport measures) and by the Highways Agency (in respect of the A14 improvements). We agree with the SPAs that it is appropriate, therefore, for Policy P8/10 to draw a clearer distinction between the CHUMMS proposals and the other multi-modal studies for the A47 Norwich to Peterborough corridor and the London and South

Midlands corridor, the results of which are still awaited. Accordingly, we suggest an amended form of wording in the recommendations below. We note that the A428 improvements do not form part of CHUMMS and it seems more logical to us to include these under the Trunk Road proposals.

- 6.81 In addition, it was generally agreed that it is inappropriate and unnecessary for the Structure Plan to specify the standard of improvements to the A14. Although the CHUMMS proposals refer to a dual 3-lane standard road from Fen Ditton to south of Huntingdon, the precise details and specification are being worked up by the Highways Agency and may vary. Similarly, in respect of the other multi-modal studies it is wrong for the policy simply to endorse ‘all’ the schemes which may emerge from the studies. Some may be appropriate to the Structure Plan strategy, others may not. Again we incorporate an amended form of wording in our recommendations.
- 6.82 A recurring issue throughout the EIP was the extent to which the transport and development strategy relies upon delivery of the CHUMMS proposals and the implications of delays in any elements of it, notably upon a start to building the new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington. We have touched upon this already in Chapter 3 and we discuss the implications for the new settlement in more detail in Chapter 9. In the light of all that we heard during the EIP and the various assurances and programming documents that we received from all the parties concerned,¹² we are satisfied that those parts of the CHUMMS proposals on which the spatial strategy most relies are capable of being delivered within the planned timescale. Insofar as there is any delay, we believe there is sufficient flexibility in the Plan to make adjustments through the normal processes of monitoring and managing the programme of development. As indicated in Chapter 7, we do not believe there is a need for a ‘fall-back’ strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region to cope with contingencies such as delays in delivering infrastructure.

Buses, Cycling and Walking and Interchanges

- 6.83 There is probably more overlap and repetition between these three sections of Policy P8/10 and the generic policies in the rest of Chapter 8 than anywhere else. Nevertheless, given that the emphasis of the investment priorities as a whole is to promote more sustainable travel modes – and since the duplication did not appear to concern participants at the EIP – we are content not to suggest any major pruning.
- 6.84 The minor changes we recommend mainly arise from suggestions made at the EIP, either by the SPAs themselves or by participants. These involve:
- integrating the references to park and ride and interchanges under a single heading;
 - amending the reference to park and ride sites by substituting ‘for’ instead of ‘in’ Cambridge, Peterborough, Market Towns and other locations (to recognise that park and ride sites may be outside rather than within the urban areas);
 - adding a reference to ‘Peterborough’ to the first bullet point under ‘Interchanges’ (to reflect the fact that rural interchanges may be required close to Peterborough as well as Cambridge);

¹² Key documents include SPA Supplements 2, 3 and 17 and a Joint Statement by Cambridgeshire County Council, GO-East and the Highways Agency on the Delivery of Transport Infrastructure in Relation to the Proposed New Settlement at Longstanton/Oakington.

- including a mention under ‘Cycling and Walking’ that measures should seek to increase ‘usage’ as well as the ‘*capacity and safety*’ of pedestrian and cycle routes (so as to more clearly signal the underlying aim of the policy).

6.85 In addition, we recommend that the list of bus schemes in this part of the policy should be strengthened by including a further bullet point to refer to ‘*bus priorities on orbital routes around Cambridge*’. This will complement the reference to bus priorities on key radial routes and reflect the Panel’s conclusion later in this chapter that the transport strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region should explicitly recognise the need for better orbital connections around the city.

Rail

- 6.86 The policy includes a long list of strategic and local rail improvements. The key question which arose in the debate was whether they could all be implemented within the Plan period. The Strategic Rail Authority indicated that under their 10 year plan, published in January 2002, the schemes listed in the policy fall into the category of non-committed, medium term priorities and there could be no guarantee that they could come forward during the Structure Plan period. Although it is likely that they will all be implemented in due course this will be subject to affordability and operational issues. All schemes will have to be reviewed by the SRA because of limitations on funding for schemes nationally.
- 6.87 Despite this somewhat down-beat prognosis the SRA indicated that they had no objection to the schemes remaining in the Structure Plan as medium to long-term aspirations. Some of the local schemes may be capable of progressing through the Rail Passenger Partnership or private funding, such as a proposal for a new station and interchange at Chesterton, linking with the Rapid Transit System. Others, such as proposed new stations at Hampton, south of Peterborough, and at Addenbrooke’s, are subject to the resolution of rail capacity and operational issues. As we indicate in Chapter 9, doubts over the timing of improvements to Cambridge Station and the West Anglia Route Modernisation Enhancement (WARM-E) scheme also pose major questions about the feasibility of a proposed rail shuttle associated with the Waterbeach new settlement option.
- 6.88 Since there is nothing to suggest that the rail improvements definitely cannot be implemented during the 15 year period of the Structure Plan, we accept that it is appropriate to retain them in the policy. This will help to signal their importance from a local strategic point of view. Unlike the Rapid Transit System or A14 improvements, however, it does not appear to us that these elements of rail infrastructure are so vital in supporting the major development proposals in the Plan that a failure to deliver will undermine the whole strategy. Insofar as they are important to particular schemes, the provisions of Policies P8/1 and P8/2 will ensure that development takes cognisance of their timing.
- 6.89 We endorse certain minor amendments proposed by the SRA to the wording of the policy and its footnotes in respect of improvements on the East Coast mainline, the Felixtowe-Nuneaton line between Ely and Peterborough, and the possibility of a new station in or to the north of Peterborough. These reflect more accurately the present position on these proposals. Otherwise we do not recommend any changes to the list of rail improvements.
- 6.90 The SRA also suggested that the Plan should refer specifically to the requirement for local planning authorities to consult with the SRA in relation to any new or improved rail facilities. Although we recognise that the SRA is not a statutory consultee on planning matters we cannot envisage a situation arising in which any proposals for development

affecting the rail network or railway facilities would be likely to come forward without such consultation and we would regard such guidance as too detailed for inclusion in the Structure Plan.

Roads

- 6.91 Some participants argued that the list of local and trunk road improvements included in Policy P8/10 was too long and unnecessary and implied that the SPAs were pursuing a road based transport strategy. The Panel accepts that some road building is inevitable in order to address the infrastructure deficit and support new development. We are satisfied that the schemes are either strategic improvements designed to enhance connections within and outside the area or are related to major new development proposals. Their main purpose is to reduce environmental impact, improve safety and increase the efficiency of movement, including for public transport. We note that a number of the schemes are already firm commitments in the Highways Agency programme or the Local Transport Plan.
- 6.92 Again there are some minor wording changes which we recommend to the bullet points, reflecting points made in the discussion and/or accepted by the SPAs:
- to replace ‘*other bypasses*’ with ‘*other schemes*’;
 - to replace a reference to an ‘*Addenbrookes-M11 access road*’ with ‘*access road from Hauxton Road to Clay Farm and Addenbrooke’s*’.
- 6.93 We have also considered various other suggestions for deleting particular road schemes or including others but can find no justification for making further changes to the policy.

RECOMMENDATION 6L

Incorporate the following amendments into Policy P8/10:

Multi-Modal Studies:

- ‘*Schemes recommended in the preferred plan for the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon (CHUMMS) corridor, including on and off line improvements to the A14 and other agreed measures;*
- *Other schemes appropriate to the development strategy, arising from the multi-modal studies for the A47 Norwich to Peterborough corridor and the London and South Midlands corridor (LSMMS).*’

Buses:

- ‘*bus priorities on orbital routes around Cambridge*’

Delete park and ride sites and amalgamate last bullet point with Interchanges.

Rail:

- ‘*East Coast Mainline upgrade, including:*
- *Peterborough Station improvements*
- *improving access to the Lincoln lines*

- *providing extra tracks south of Peterborough*
- *Improvements to the Felixstowe-Nuneaton rail route, including:*
 - *upgrading to increase freight capacity*
 - *extending the line between Ely junction and Soham*
 - *possible electrification and station enhancement between Ely and Peterborough*

Typeface of 'Local Schemes' to be changed to normal from bold.

Cycling and Walking:

'Measures to increase the capacity, usage and safety of pedestrian and cycle routes'

'Park and Ride' and Interchanges:

- *'park and ride sites for Cambridge, Peterborough, Market Towns and other locations*
- *rural transport interchanges close to or between Cambridge, Peterborough and the Market Towns'*

Local Roads:

- *'other schemes with significant environmental benefits*
- *access road from Hauxton Road to Clay Farm and Addenbrooke's'*

Trunk Roads:

Amend the second bullet point to read:

- *A428 corridor between Cambridge and St. Neots (A1) – Caxton Common to Hardwick includes developer contributions;*

Delete reference to Addenbrooke's-M11 access road.

Amend the first footnote to the policy to read: *'Such schemes include the possibility of a new station in or to the north of Peterborough'*.

Cambridge Sub-Region (Policy P9/10)

- 6.94 As indicated at the outset of this chapter, we agree with those participants who felt that Policy P9/10 ought to start by summarising what the overall long term transport strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is intended to be, so as to provide a proper framework for the list of schemes which follows. This will help to get over the problem that by linking particular elements of transport infrastructure to particular major developments – which we otherwise regard as a helpful approach – the policy appears as too fragmented and gives no clear impression of what the over-arching strategy amounts to.
- 6.95 Some of the building blocks for such a statement already appear in the introductory paragraph to the policy but they are not comprehensive and are only referred to in the context of developer requirements over and above the major transport infrastructure listed in the rest of the policy. The key elements which need to comprise the strategy, drawing

upon the debate we had on this topic and incorporating the points already in the policy, are:

- the provision of a network of high quality public transport services to link key centres of activity in the Sub-Region and to facilitate major development opportunities, commencing with a rapid transit system between Cambridge and Huntingdon and between Cambridge city centre and Trumpington;
- other improvements to public transport along key routes into the city, market towns and rural centres;
- the development of orbital routes linking major development sites, employment locations and park and ride sites;
- demand management measures in Cambridge City to discourage car use, reduce congestion and give priority to the efficient running of public transport and the rapid transit system;
- more widespread improvements in facilities for walking and cycling;
- localised highway improvement schemes required to provide access to development;
- infrastructure improvements to achieve safer travel and improved mobility for the disabled.

6.96 We have already stressed, in the context of Policy P8/4 and in respect of the Rapid Transit System, the importance we attach to the introduction of effective demand management measures in Cambridge. We regard this as a central feature of a future transport strategy for the Sub-Region. Our view is reinforced by additional material on transport modelling which was produced by the SPAs (SPA Supplement 15). This noted that the MENTOR/SATURN land use transport model forecasts a potentially significant increase in traffic in the city as a result of the changing land use predicated by the Structure Plan strategy. It is estimated that car trips into and out of Cambridge could grow by about 22%. However, the modelling does suggest that the Structure Plan strategy is likely to be successful in containing this traffic growth providing use is made of a range of demand management measures along with investment in the planned infrastructure.

6.97 We note that the transport testing of development options by the County Council and W S Atkins concluded that a strategy based on major urban expansion would result in the need for new orbital road routes.¹³ This was a theme picked up by Cambridge Futures and others in discussion during the EIP. In spite of the additional material on transport modelling referred to above, we believe that there is a need to create efficient orbital movement around Cambridge and that this may require some further selective road building. Our recommendation in Chapter 8 that the proposed urban expansion to the east of Cambridge Airport should be deleted from the Plan may reduce to some extent the need for orbital routes but will not remove it altogether. It is important, in our view, that any further road improvements should give priority to facilitating access by public transport rather than simply providing additional capacity for car movement.

6.98 Looking to the longer term, it was suggested to us that what the Cambridge area needs is a comprehensive transport study, perhaps by extending the CHUMMS multi-modal work to cover the rest of the Sub-Region. We have some sympathy with this view. We are aware that Cambridge Futures have been working on a study of transport options,

¹³ Cambridge Sub-Region Development Options, Land Use and Transport Testing. Cambridgeshire County Council and W S Atkins, October 2001 (CD. 2.6.1.)

including a network of high quality public transport and improved cycling and walking facilities, an orbital road around Cambridge and a congestion road pricing scheme. This may provide the framework for any more detailed transport modelling that may be required. Such work would best be undertaken following any guidance which emerges from RPG14 on the long term growth and development of the Sub-Region, taking into account the SPAs' response to the Panel's recommendations on the future pattern of development.

Transport Infrastructure Proposals

6.99 We turn now to the details of the various schemes identified in Policy P9/10 to support major developments in Cambridge, the Green Belt releases, the new settlement and the market towns and other centres.

6.100 A number of participants said that whilst such a list was helpful, the schemes should be more clearly prioritised in relation to the phasing of major developments. It would not be appropriate to try to do this in the body of the policy itself but we endorse the SPAs' suggestion to incorporate in the supporting text a table showing the indicative timing of major transport infrastructure in relation to the start of development at major locations (based on SPA Supplement 31). Together with the SPAs' proposal to issue a full implementation programme for the Sub-Region in the form of Supplementary Planning Guidance (see Chapter 5), this should meet participants' requirements for more detail and provide a comprehensive means of monitoring and managing the delivery of infrastructure in relation to the programme of development. The mechanism for doing this will be via the Stakeholder Partnership.

6.101 In the interests of consistency with our recommendations elsewhere and to reflect points made in discussion or in written representations, we recommend the following amendments to the list of schemes:

- rationalise the references to the rapid transit system to make them more specific to the developments in question and reduce the amount of repetition;
- omit the reference under Cambridge Airport to '*additional requirements identified in the joint study of the eastern sector*' (the Panel has recommended in Chapter 8 that development east of the airport should be deleted);
- add a reference under South and West of Addenbrooke's Hospital to a proposed '*new station at Addenbrooke's*' (to maintain consistency with Policy P8/10);
- change the heading for 'Clay Farm and area to the north of Shelford' to '*Areas east and south east of Trumpington*' (to maintain consistency with our revised Policy P9/3c), and amalgamate with the previous heading for South and West of Addenbrooke's Hospital (since these areas are to be handled together for masterplanning purposes and the infrastructure requirements are the same);
- delete reference to improvements to the A14 to *dual 3 lane standard* under the New Settlement and Market Towns etc headings (to maintain consistency with the Panel's recommendation on Policy P8/10);
- amalgamate the sub-sections under the Market Towns etc headings to a series of bullet points similar to the equivalent section in Policy P10/7 (to provide greater consistency with the latter and to avoid the impression that there are no specific proposals for settlements other than Huntingdon and St. Neots).

We incorporate revised wording for the relevant parts of the policy in our recommendations below.

RECOMMENDATION 6M

Delete the first paragraph of Policy P9/10 and replace with:

‘The Transport Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is based on:

- *The provision of a network of high quality public transport services along key transport corridors connecting Cambridge with the Market Towns, other centres and major development sites; the first phase will be a rapid transit system between Cambridge, St. Ives and Huntingdon and between the city centre and Trumpington*
- *Other improvements to public transport services along key routes into the city, Market Towns and Rural Centres*
- *The development of orbital routes around Cambridge to facilitate movement avoiding the city centre and connecting major development sites, employment locations and park and ride sites; priority will be given to public transport along such routes*
- *Demand management measures in Cambridge City to discourage car use, reduce congestion and give priority to the efficient running of the rapid transit system and other public transport services*
- *The development of more widespread facilities to encourage walking and cycling*
- *Localised highway improvement schemes required to provide access to development*
- *Infrastructure improvements to achieve safer travel and improved mobility for the disabled*

Within this strategy the transport infrastructure requirements at key development sites will be as follows:’

Then insert the remaining part of the policy with the following amendments/additions:

Cambridge Airport

- *‘Rapid transit link to city centre as a second phase of the project described in the strategy above*
- *New interchange on A14, replacing Fen Ditton interchange, linked to Airport Way’*

South and West of Addenbrooke’s Hospital and East and South of Trumpington

- *‘Completion of rapid transit link from Trumpington and Addenbrooke’s Hospital to Cambridge*
- *New station on main line at Addenbrooke’s’*

New Settlement at Longstanton/Oakington

- *‘Completion of rapid transit link through the new settlement as part of Cambridge-St. Ives-Huntingdon system, with links to Trumpington and Addenbrooke’s and appropriate provision of halts to serve the new settlement, and a park and ride facility’*
- *On and off line improvements to the A14, local parallel roads and other agreed measures proposed by the CHUMMS study’*

Market Towns, Previously Established New Settlements and Rural Centres
‘To support development in Huntingdon, St. Neots, St. Ives, Ely, Chatteris, Cambourne and designated rural centres:

- *Improved bus services related to development locations*
- *Rapid transit link from Huntingdon to Cambridge and improvements to A14 in accordance with CHUMMS proposals*
- *Improvements on A428 corridor between Cambridge and St. Neots (A1) including development of a high quality public transport link via Cambourne*
- *Improvements on A10 corridor between Cambridge and Ely, including development of a high quality public transport link*
- *Local transport improvements including, where appropriate, rural interchanges, bus priority measures and other schemes to be brought forward through Market Town Strategies’*

Insert a table into the supporting text, after paragraph 9.52, to show the indicative phasing of major developments in relation to the delivery of major transport infrastructure for the Cambridge Sub-Region (as in SPA Supplement 31).

Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire Sub-Region (Policy P10/7)

- 6.102 There were fewer concerns from participants about the scope and contents of Policy P10/7 for the Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area than there were in respect of the equivalent policy for the Cambridge Sub-Region.
- 6.103 The SPAs may wish to consider the merits of bringing the generic transport elements together in a strategy statement for the Sub-Region as a whole, followed by the scheme specific details, similar to the approach we recommend for the Cambridge Sub-Region. However we would not regard this as essential since there are fewer named items of infrastructure included in this policy and it is reasonably clear as it stands.
- 6.104 Otherwise the only specific change required is to amend the reference to facilities at Peterborough station to an *‘enhanced central railway station’* rather than a *‘new’* station. This was agreed by the SPAs following a representation from the Strategic Rail Authority.
- 6.105 We do not think it is necessary to include in this policy a reference to rail freight facilities, as suggested by some participants, since these are covered adequately under our proposed revisions to Policy P8/11. Though important in their own right, we would not regard freight facilities as a vital element in a transport strategy to support development in Peterborough.
- 6.106 Finally, we endorse the SPAs’ proposal to add a table to the supporting text showing the relationship between infrastructure delivery and the phasing of major development, similar to the one for the Cambridge Sub-Region.

RECOMMENDATION 6N

The SPAs may wish to consider a revision of Policy P10/7 to bring together key elements of an over-arching transport strategy for the whole of the Sub-Region, followed by specific infrastructure schemes.

Amend fourth bullet point of Policy P9/10 under Peterborough to read:

- *‘support key infrastructure schemes which will enhance Peterborough’s interchange capabilities including an enhanced central railway station with excellent linkages to the bus station and appropriate car parking’.*

Insert a table into the supporting text, after paragraph 10.26, to show the indicative phasing of major development in relation to the delivery of major transport infrastructure for Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire (as in SPA Supplement 31).

CHAPTER 7

CAMBRIDGE SUB-REGION

7.1 Chapter 9 of the Structure Plan sets out the strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region. In this part of the Report we start by considering the vision and strategy for the Sub-Region as it is spelt out in paragraph 9.9 and Policy P9/1. We then go on to consider other policies relating to: the detailed housing distribution (Policy P9/2), the role of the Market Towns (Policies P9/5 and P9/6) and the selective management of employment (Policy P9/8). A number of other issues relating to the Cambridge Sub-Region have been addressed elsewhere in this Report, ie:

- Deliverability (including Policy P9/9) – Chapter 3;
- Strategic Employment Sites – Chapter 4;
- Use of previously developed land, density and affordable housing – Chapter 5;
- Transport (including Policy P9/10 ‘Cambridge Sub-Region Transport Strategy’) – Chapter 6;
- Green Belt – Chapter 8;
- New Settlement – Chapter 9.

We do not propose to rehearse these matters again in this chapter.

VISION AND STRATEGY

7.2 The Cambridge Sub-Region is defined in RPG6 as comprising ‘*Cambridge and the surrounding area as far as the ring of market towns*’ (paragraph 5.9). So far as this Structure Plan is concerned the Sub-Region includes the Market Towns of Ely, Chatteris, Huntingdon, St Neots and St Ives. The remaining Market Towns in the Sub-Region, which lie to the east and south of the city¹, are outside Cambridgeshire. RPG6 sets the context for the development of a planning framework for the Sub-Region which ‘*will allow the ... development needs to be met in a sustainable way*’ (paragraph 5.12). This is provided in Policy 21 which requires that the ‘*local authorities ... should develop a vision and planning framework*’ for the Sub-Region. It sets out a number of factors to be reflected in that vision and planning framework.

Vision

7.3 There was much discussion at the EIP about whether the Structure Plan needed to set out a ‘vision’ for the Sub-Region or whether this was addressed adequately by RPG6. The Panel agrees with GO-East who described Policy 21 as setting out ‘objectives’ rather than a ‘vision’. We believe that it would be helpful to refine these objectives and set out in a nutshell what the key features of the Sub-Region are intended to be, in the form of an overarching vision. This will help to set a context for the significant change in the strategy for the Sub-Region which is promoted by RPG6 and on which the Structure Plan is founded.

¹ Newmarket, Haverhill, Saffron Walden and Royston.

- 7.4 As to what form that vision should take, we were referred to the broad vision for the Sub-Region contained in the Buchanan Study²: *'The vision is to protect and enhance important qualities of the Sub-Region, build on its potential to provide an enhanced quality of life in more sustainable ways, enhance its major role in the regional and national economy and promote more sustainable patterns of movement'* (paragraph 3.2). The Study went on to set out the qualities to be promoted and those to be safeguarded. The former reflect the objectives listed in Policy 21 of RPG6.
- 7.5 We agree with those who suggested that this broad vision is rather too general and, taken on its own, could apply to almost anywhere. We were recommended to base the vision on the content of paragraph 9.24 of the Plan. However, this is dealing specifically with the city of Cambridge rather than with the Sub-Region as a whole. In our view, a more comprehensive vision is needed for the Sub-Region which more fully reflects the objectives of Policy 21 of RPG6, but in a simpler form. The vision needs to make it clear that the Sub-Region will continue the development of its buoyant economy, as referred to in paragraph 5.10 of RPG6, and that it will remain as a centre of excellence in higher education. It must also reflect the substantial shift in the development strategy for the Sub-Region which is required by RPG6 and the provision of related integrated transport systems, including high quality public transport networks, which will help to deliver more sustainable travel patterns in the Sub-Region. We set out our suggested vision in our recommendations below. We believe that this addresses the various issues raised by participants as to what it should cover, whilst representing a reasonably concise and descriptive view of the role of the Sub-Region as envisaged in RPG6.
- 7.6 At the EIP the SPAs produced a diagrammatic vision for the Sub-Region (SPA Supplement 29) which they felt might be included in the supporting text to the Plan. Appropriately amended to reflect other recommendations, notably the deletion of the restraint area to south of the city, we believe that this would be helpful in clarifying the vision and strategy.

Strategy

- 7.7 We find the early part of Chapter 9 to be rather unfocussed, confusing and repetitious, with its numerous references to the strategy variously set out in paragraphs 9.4, 9.9 and 9.11-9.13 and again in Policy P9/1 Paragraph 9.9 actually sets out, in 10 sub-paragraphs, what is described as *'the strategy'* incorporating *'the key elements of the vision'* in RPG6. Confusingly, this appears under the heading the *'Vision for the Cambridge Sub-Region'*. In our view, the various references to the strategy in the text need to be amalgamated under one sub-heading, edited to ensure that they are sufficiently comprehensive and reflect the vision, but avoid repetition. In particular, we suggest that paragraphs 9.11-9.13 might provide an introduction to the strategy section whilst the bullet points in paragraph 9.4, elaborated and expanded upon by the detail in paragraph 9.9, will provide a clearer explanation of the strategy. We suggest that the strategy is set out in bullet point format to avoid giving the impression that the individual elements are listed in an order of importance. The SPAs will need to ensure that the text includes all elements of the strategy and addresses each part of the vision.
- 7.8 We were offered suggestions as to how Policy P9/1 might be made more focussed and how it might more clearly set out the strategy for the Sub-Region. A wide range of issues were raised by various participants, most of which are dealt with elsewhere. However,

² Cambridge Sub Region Study, September 2001 (CD2.1).

there are two issues which need to be addressed specifically in relation to Policy P9/1. These are:

- whether the Plan should provide a ‘fall-back’ option in the event that the strategy was unable to deliver the required change by 2006;
- the requirement for the Plan to provide scope for continuing development beyond 2016.

‘Fall-back’ strategy

7.9 In relation to the suggested need for a ‘fall-back’ strategy, which was put forward by those seeking to bring forward alternative major development options, we appreciate the complexity of the issues which are to be addressed in the Cambridge Sub-Region. We also recognise the difficulties which will be faced by the authorities in their attempts to ‘turn the supertanker’ to meet the new approach to accommodating the needs of this dynamic and buoyant Sub-Region. However, the answer to this is not to provide further options at this stage. We have dealt at some length in Chapter 3 with the deliverability of the strategy and we highlight later in this chapter the extent of flexibility in the housing provision. If, as a result of monitoring progress, it is concluded that the strategy is not working to deliver the change required, the proper approach would be to review the strategy.

7.10 Overall, we are satisfied that the Plan, as modified by our recommendations, provides sufficient flexibility, in terms of a range of locations, both committed and to be brought forward through the development plan process, to enable the strategy to be delivered, given commitment by all involved in the process. Additional or alternative options, such as the bringing forward of a second new settlement during the early part of the Plan period, would simply add to the complexity of the issues to be addressed. We have some sympathy with the view expressed by one participant and echoed by some of the LPAs that the resource implications, in terms of staff availability and time commitment, of pursuing too many options for development are not to be disregarded.

Post-2016

7.11 We are conscious of the need for this Plan to ‘allow scope for, rather than constrain, development beyond 2016’ (Policy 21 RPG6). In Chapter 8 we conclude that the Plan should not safeguard land to the east of Cambridge Airport for long-term development post-2016 because major development in this location would not accord with the vision of Cambridge as a compact city. We also note that, having regard to the assessment carried out in the Buchanan Study, there may be scope for more development than allowed for by the SPAs within other Green Belt locations identified on the edge of the city. We have, in addition, identified one further location west of Trumpington Road which should be considered for inclusion in Policy P9/3c. This would give additional scope for flexibility and for longer-term growth in the Sub-Region.

7.12 An alternative option debated at the EIP was a second new settlement. We deal with the arguments about such an approach in Chapter 9 where we conclude that this option would represent the next most sustainable solution to long-term growth in the Sub-Region, after locations on the edge of the city. Whilst any decision on this can be left until later, we believe that the vision should reflect the potential for the development needs of the Sub-Region to be met in one or more new settlements, as well as in new communities on the edge of Cambridge. The inclusion within the Plan of a clear vision statement for the Sub-Region, which includes these elements, will help to inform the debate on RPG14.

Policy P9/1

- 7.13 Whilst we accept that the strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is complex we are unconvinced that there is a need for a separate policy along the lines of P9/1. We note that there is no policy similar to P9/1 for the Peterborough and North Cambridge area and that much of Plan is, inevitably, focussed on the issues facing the Cambridge Sub-Region as it is here that much of the change over the Plan period will be concentrated. It is our opinion that the inclusion of a specific vision for the Sub-Region early in Chapter 9 of the Plan, followed by a clear explanation of the strategy as described above and cross-referred, as appropriate, to the relevant policies which give expression to, and the means to implement, specific elements of the strategy³, is all that is required for the Plan. Although it would not form ‘policy’, the vision statement would give clear expression to what the Plan is aiming to achieve through its policies. Given its importance, the SPAs might find it helpful to give some emphasis to this vision statement in their presentation of it in the text.

RECOMMENDATION 7A

Delete Policy P9/1.

Set out the following vision early in Chapter 9 under the sub-heading ‘Vision for the Cambridge Sub-Region’:

‘The vision for the Cambridge Sub-Region is that it will continue to develop as a centre of excellence and world leader in the fields of higher education and research and it will foster dynamism, prosperity and further expansion of the knowledge-based economy spreading outwards from Cambridge, whilst protecting and enhancing the historic character and the setting of Cambridge as a compact city, the character and setting of the Market Towns and other settlements in the Sub-Region, and the important environmental qualities of the surrounding area. Sustainable and spatially concentrated patterns of high quality, socially inclusive development will be focussed on Cambridge, in the form of new communities on the edge of the city and in one or more new settlements, and in the Market Towns, to provide a more sustainable balance between jobs and homes. Integrated transport systems related closely to the development patterns in the Sub-Region, including high quality public transport networks, will deliver more sustainable travel patterns. An attractive, ecologically rich and accessible countryside will be facilitated. Development will be delivered by means of a co-ordinated approach which maximises and integrates the different sources of investment.’

The SPAs may wish to consider giving this vision some form of presentational emphasis by, for example, highlighting the text or putting it in a box.

Insert the diagrammatic vision for the Cambridge Sub-Region as shown on SPA Supplement 29, amended to delete reference to the area of housing restraint to the south of the city.

Insert a new sub-heading ‘Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region’ to follow the vision statement and incorporate thereunder the current text in paragraphs 9.4, 9.9 and 9.11-9.13, appropriately edited to avoid repetition, using bullet point format. All elements of

³ For example, a cross-reference to Policy P9/4 would be included in relation to the new settlement proposals currently referred to in sub-paragraph b) of paragraph 9.9.

the strategy must be covered in the context of the vision. Insert appropriate cross-references to the appropriate policies which provide the means by which the strategy will be implemented.

HOUSING PROVISION (Policy P9/2)

7.14 We have dealt with the broad allocation of housing at District level in Chapter 5. Here we address Policy P9/2 which provides a more detailed distribution of housing within the Cambridge Sub-Region.

7.15 Policy P9/2 provides for the construction of 47,500 homes in the Sub-Region between 1999 and 2016, to be distributed as follows:

District	Cambs	South Cambs	East Cambs	Hunts	Fenland	Total
Cambridge built up area	6,500	2,400				8,900
Edge of Cambridge/Green Belt	6,000	2,000				8,000
New settlement		6,000				6,000
Market Towns and rural centres		5,500	3,500	6,500	1,500	17,000
Elsewhere in Sub-Region		4,100	2,500	1,000		7,600
TOTAL	12,500	20,000	6,000	7,500	1,500	47,500

7.16 The policy also refers to the need for:

- joint working between Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire to determine the most appropriate form and phasing of developments on the edge of Cambridge;
- the phasing of development in local plans and allowance for development needs continuing beyond 2016;
- provision for 30% affordable housing plus additional key worker housing;
- a limitation on housing growth south of Cambridge in order to restrict development which is likely to lead to long distance commuting.

7.17 The key issues arising from the debate at the EIP concern:

- Whether the level of detail in the policy is appropriate for a structure plan, having regard to the guidance in RPG6;
- Whether the distribution of housing among the different locations adequately represents the sequential shift in the pattern of development being sought by RPG6 and the extent to which it is realistic and achievable;
- Whether the previous policy of restraining development to the south of Cambridge should be carried forward in this Structure Plan.

Level of Detail

- 7.18 Policy P9/2 derives from Policy 22 of RPG6 which sets an order of preference for identifying locations for housing and related development in the Cambridge Sub-Region. The first three locational categories in the table above are the same as those in RPG6 Policy 22. The final two, ‘Market Towns and Rural Centres’ and ‘Elsewhere in the Sub-Region’ are different. RPG’s final two categories refer instead to: *‘within the built up area of market towns, larger villages and previously established new settlements where good public transport access to Cambridge exists or can be provided, provided that growth in car commuting can be minimised’*; and *‘by extensions...’* to the same locations.
- 7.19 Some participants questioned whether Policy P9/2 was too detailed for a structure plan and would unduly constrain the flexibility of LPAs to distribute housing development in accordance with the sequential approach set out in RPG6 Policy 22 and interpreted in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. PPG12 ‘Development Plans’ (paragraph 3.8) indicates that housing or employment provisions below district level should only be included in structure plans where it is necessary to distinguish between the needs of different areas within a district for strategic purposes.
- 7.20 We are satisfied that the special circumstances in the Cambridge Sub-Region fully meet this requirement. RPG6 Policy 22 and related policies clearly establish the importance of moving towards a more sustainable pattern of growth in the Sub-Region and justify the principle, on strategic grounds, of including more detail in the Structure Plan than is normal. Policy P9/2 is based on a great deal of detailed work examining capacity in a sequential way across the Cambridge Sub-Region, firstly by the Buchanan Study and then jointly by the LPAs in preparing the Structure Plan. This, together with the further detailed examination of locations for the new settlement and for Green Belt releases, is work required by RPG6 which would otherwise have had to be undertaken at Local Plan level. It is therefore appropriate, in our view, for Policy P9/2 to be reasonably clear and precise about where housing growth should be located within the Sub-Region.
- 7.21 Nevertheless, it is evident from the debate at the EIP that there is still a degree of fluidity and uncertainty about the precise figures in the policy, arising from:
- the possibility that urban capacity within the Cambridge built up area may be greater or less than estimated (see below);
 - the timing of when Green Belt releases will become available, notably the Airport site (see Chapter 8);
 - uncertainty about whether the new settlement can achieve a target of 6,000 dwellings by 2016 (see Chapter 9);
 - the outcome of any further reviews of existing commitments, in accordance with Policy P1/4.
- 7.22 Notwithstanding that these are issues which may be addressed through the plan, monitor and manage process, we feel that it would be helpful for the Plan to make it clear that the figures in Policy P9/2 are intended to be applied flexibly. For this reason, we suggest firstly that the policy should state that the figures are indicative only and not intended to be regarded as rigid limits or precise targets.
- 7.23 Secondly, we recommend that the figures for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire in the first two categories – ‘Cambridge built-up area’ and ‘Edge of Cambridge subject to review of Green Belt boundary’ – should be bracketed together to signify that there is a

degree of interchangeability between them. This recognises, in particular, that some of the Green Belt release sites straddle the boundary between the City and South Cambridgeshire and it is not possible to pre-determine how much housing is likely to fall on one side of the boundary or the other. The policy already recognises that the City and South Cambridgeshire will work together to determine the most appropriate form and phasing of development on the edge of Cambridge. In our view, it would be appropriate under the new planning system for the two authorities to extend the present degree of co-operation and work together on preparing a joint Local Development Framework for the Cambridge area. Bracketing the housing figures together will facilitate such an approach.

- 7.24 Thirdly, we endorse a suggestion made by the SPAs that the last two locational categories in the policy should be combined. It is clear from the discussion at the EIP that the distinction between ‘Market Towns and Rural Centres’ and ‘Elsewhere in the Region’ is not altogether clear and the Panel can see no particular merit on strategic grounds in the Structure Plan seeking to specify how much development should be allocated to each. These two categories contain a high proportion of the housing commitments in the Cambridge Sub-Region and in accordance with Policy P1/4 (and the Panel’s recommendations in Chapter 5) LPAs should be expected to review these allocations according to the search sequence in Policy P1/1. Combining the figures will provide a greater degree of flexibility in this process.
- 7.25 We recommend that this combined category should be re-titled to embrace Market Towns, Previously Established New Settlements (PENS) and Rural Centres. This will make the policy more consistent with the terminology used in RPG6 Policy 22 and also reflect the Panel’s view that there may be a greater role for an expanded Cambourne in meeting part of the Sub-Region’s housing needs (see Chapter 9). We also recommend that the policy specifies that, in identifying housing sites within this category, local planning authorities will have regard to the locational criteria set out in Policy P1/1 to ensure that preference is given to the most sustainable sites.
- 7.26 Finally, we have previously recommended in Chapter 5 that Supplementary Planning Guidance on the phasing of housing development should be prepared; this will need to be referred to in the policy. In the same connection, we have recommended that an additional paragraph should be included in the text supporting Policy P9/2, explaining that, where monitoring shows that any stages in the development sequence are significantly falling short of what the Plan anticipates, then the indicative housing figures across the whole of the Sub-Region may need to be reviewed and amended in consultation with the Stakeholder Partnership. A form of wording, drawing upon a suggestion made by South Cambridgeshire District Council, is included in our recommendations below.

Distribution of Housing

- 7.27 We now turn to the detailed distribution of housing among the different locational categories in the policy.

Within the built up area of Cambridge

- 7.28 6,500 dwellings are expected to be accommodated within the built up area of Cambridge within the City’s boundaries, and 2,400 in South Cambridgeshire. The 2,400 is partly accounted for by land already committed on the Northern Fringe, an earlier release of land from the Green Belt on the edge of the city. Part of the remainder is dependent upon the relocation of Marshalls Aerospace.

- 7.29 The figure of 6,500 for Cambridge City is based on a recent urban capacity study⁴ which assessed a discounted capacity on brownfield and other urban sites of around 3,670 dwellings, plus existing commitments (completions and land with planning permission) of around 2,860.
- 7.30 Although the urban capacity study was generally regarded as a thorough exercise, the HBF questioned how much reliance could be placed on some of its assumptions, for instance regarding densities, the marketability of sites and the discount rates used. It was also suggested that there may have been some double counting between data based on past trends and the figure for existing commitments. Adjusting for these differences would reduce the capacity by up to 1,000 dwellings.
- 7.31 The City Council provided a detailed and spirited defence of their methodology, which was based closely on best practice guidance in the DETR document 'Tapping the Potential'. Other participants generally felt that the exercise was comprehensive and sound. The Panel concurs with this view. Whilst there is inevitably a high degree of uncertainty in trying to assess how many urban sites might come forward for development, we note that the method employed by the City Council results in a total assessed capacity of over 8,000 dwellings, which is then discounted to around 3,670, a 54% reduction. Some of the particular discounts applied, for instance, to '*redevelopment of existing other uses*' are recognised in the City's report as tending to underestimate likely future capacity. For these reasons we lean towards the view that it is just as likely that the overall capacity of the city has been underestimated as overestimated. Under the arrangements for plan, monitor and manage, and the flexible phasing of development which we recommend for this policy, it will be possible for the LPAs to respond to changing circumstances and amend the allocations in locations lower down the sequential order if significantly more, or less, capacity within the city emerges.

Edge of Cambridge, subject to Green Belt review

- 7.32 The 8,000 dwellings in this category (6,000 in Cambridge City and 2,000 in South Cambridgeshire) are based on an assessment of the capacity of the Green Belt releases in Policy P9/3c and the rate at which they might come forward. The total estimated capacity of such sites (less the area east of Cambridge Airport which we recommend for deletion from the Plan) is around 15,000 dwellings.⁵ It was made clear at the EIP that around 2,500 dwellings of the remaining 7,000 capacity currently planned for release post 2016 would have the potential to be phased before 2016 if required. This is clearly important in the event that the Cambridge Airport site does not become available before 2016.
- 7.33 In Chapter 8 we also recommend that an area west of Trumpington Road should be considered for addition to the portfolio of potential sites for release from the Green Belt. If this location is confirmed as suitable for development we understand it would have a capacity of somewhere between 1,000 and 1,800 dwellings. It is also a site which, in principle, should be capable of being made available early in the Plan period. For the present purposes, recognising the sensitivities of this location, we have assumed a capacity of only 1,000 dwellings.
- 7.34 We considered reallocating this amount from the 9,600 dwellings in the bottom two categories of South Cambridgeshire's allocation since this would accord best with the

⁴ Cambridge Urban Capacity Study, Final Report, Cambridge City Council, September 2002 (CD 2.7).

⁵ Appendix 1 to SPAs' EIP Statement on Issue 5B (Estimated Capacity and Indicative Phasing for Green Belt Development Locations).

locational sequence in Policy P1/1. However, we have accepted (in Chapter 2) that in the short to medium term the existing commitments in the South Cambridgeshire area will be needed in order to deliver the increased build rate required by RPG6 to be achieved by 2006. At this stage, we have insufficient information to warrant reducing the allocation of 9,600 dwellings in South Cambridgeshire and have thus assumed that the West of Trumpington Road allocation will form part of the combined allocation for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire in the 'Edge of Cambridge' category. The likely capacity and timing of this location and the effect on other allocations is a matter the SPAs will need to determine, in consultation with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, before finalising the Structure Plan.

New Settlement

- 7.35 We discuss in Chapter 9 the feasibility of the new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington delivering 6,000 dwellings by 2016. Although there are clearly some doubts as to whether the build rate can be achieved, we do not propose any amendments to Policy P9/2 in this respect. The additional flexibility in Policy P9/2, together with strengthened arrangements for phasing, monitoring and managing the release of land through the Stakeholder Partnership will enable the Plan to respond to any shortfall in the target.

Market Towns, Previously Established New Settlements and Rural Centres

- 7.36 As indicated in paragraphs 7.24-7.25, this combined category will provide greater flexibility for individual LPAs to allocate housing to the most sustainable locations, having regard to the review of commitments. In reviewing their commitments in this category South Cambridgeshire should examine the feasibility of relocating at least 1,000 dwellings from the least sustainable locations to those within or close to the city, having regard to our comments above about the west of Trumpington Road location, and also consider the scope for increasing capacity at Cambourne, in line with our recommendation in Chapter 9.
- 7.37 The allocation of 1,500 dwellings to Fenland District under this heading is entirely accounted for by development at Chatteris. We discuss below the principle of development in Chatteris in the context of Policy P9/6, which identifies the town as a priority for economic regeneration in the Cambridge Sub-Region. The policy says that further housing allocations will be dependent on improving job prospects, an approach which we endorse.
- 7.38 We understand that around 1,000 of the 1,500 dwellings at Chatteris are accounted for by existing commitments. It was explained by the SPAs that a further 500 dwellings had then been added to this figure in order to support the town's economic growth aspirations. Since this additional capacity is intended to be contingent upon clear signs of an improvement in economic prospects, we think this should be signalled by a footnote to the figures in Policy P9/2. If, in the process of monitoring and managing future development, it appears that the additional 500 dwellings at Chatteris are unlikely to be required, this allocation should be reviewed. Consideration might then need to be given to increasing the provision in other suitable locations closer to Cambridge, in order to ensure that there was no shortfall in the overall housing target for the Sub-Region.

Area of Restraint South of Cambridge

- 7.39 The reference in Policy P9/2 to restricting housing growth to the south of Cambridge has its origins in the 1989 and 1995 Structure Plans. The area of restraint was originally

intended to protect the countryside from intensive development and to restrict development which encourages long-distance commuting. The present policy refers only to the need to prevent long-distance commuting.

- 7.40 A large number of participants questioned the need for this clause in the policy, arguing that it was linked with the now out-dated strategy of dispersing growth away from Cambridge. The SPAs and others felt that it still had a role to play in deterring housing development which might serve the growth of employment further south, notably at Stansted.
- 7.41 We were presented with information from the 1991 Census⁶ showing that there is a somewhat greater tendency for employees living in parishes to the south of Cambridge to travel longer distances (20km or more and 40km or more) to work. However, this was not altogether conclusive since it is not clear where the destinations are to which people are travelling and there are also parishes elsewhere in South Cambridgeshire with a high incidence of long distance commuting. Moreover, the 1991 Census is now very out-of-date and throughout the EIP we heard both factual and anecdotal evidence of relatively high levels of commuting to London and the south from various parts of Cambridgeshire, usually locations with good rail services or good access to the M11 and other strategic routes.
- 7.42 Whilst we entirely agree with those who argued that the aim of the Cambridge Sub-Region should be to satisfy its own housing needs rather than those generated by pressures to the south, we cannot see that this requires a selective policy to restrain growth south of Cambridge. Within the context of Policies P1/1 and P9/2 some housing development to provide for the growth of high tech jobs in this area may be appropriate. Moreover, to introduce what would in effect be a two-tier strategic policy could be counter productive in that, if effective, it might encourage even longer distance commuting from areas not subject to the constraint.
- 7.43 We are reinforced in this view by the conclusions in the Inspector's Report into the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Review (CD 3.6.7) which recommends deletion of the Area of Restraint from the Local Plan on the grounds that there is no clear foundation for the policy and that the reason for it has been overtaken by other sustainability considerations. Accordingly, we recommend deletion of the reference in Policy P9/2 to limiting housing growth south of Cambridge.

Other Issues

- 7.44 In the interests of clarity, and to maintain consistency with paragraph 9.21 of the supporting text, which refers to the contribution to housing provision from changes of use or conversion of existing buildings, we think the opening sentence of Policy P9/2 should refer to the *'provision of an additional 47,500 houses'* rather than *'construction'*.
- 7.45 Our amendment to the third paragraph in Policy P9/2 regarding affordable and key worker housing, is drawn from the recommendations in Chapter 5. The wording in paragraph 9.18 will need to be changed accordingly.

⁶ SPA Supplement 8: Out County and Long Distance Commuting from South Cambridgeshire.

RECOMMENDATION 7B

Amend Policy P9/2 – ‘Housing Distribution, Cambridge Sub-Region’ as follows:

‘Provision will be made for 47,500 additional homes in the Sub-Region between 1999 and 2016, with the following indicative distribution:

District	Cambs	South Cambs	East Cambs	Hunts	Fenland	Total
Cambridge built up area	6,500	2,400				8,900
Edge of Cambridge/Green Belt	6,000	2,000				8,000
New settlement		6,000				6,000
Market Towns, Previously Established New Settlements and Rural Centres		9,600	6,000	7,500	1,500*	24,600
TOTAL	12,500	20,000	6,000	7,500	1,500	47,500

* 500 dwellings of this allocation are subject to improving job prospects in Chatteris, in accordance with Policy P9/6.

In identifying sites for development local planning authorities will give preference to the most sustainable locations, in accordance with the criteria set out in Policy P1/1.

The figures for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire are shown combined because these local planning authorities will work together to determine the most appropriate form and phasing of development on the edge of Cambridge, in order to meet the overall requirement for housing within Cambridge and in locations which are subject to Green Belt review.

Supplementary Planning Guidance will set out the phasing of development during the Plan period and allow for development needs continuing beyond 2016. Policies in local plans will set out the more detailed phasing of housing provision.

[30%]⁷ or more of the new housing in the Sub-Region will be affordable, including key worker housing. All housing development of more than 15 dwellings or on residential sites of more than 0.5ha. will be expected to contribute to this provision. Employment developments will also be expected to contribute towards affordable housing through developer contributions, in accordance with Policy P9/9.'

Add a further paragraph to the supporting text of the Plan, after paragraph 9.17, as follows: ‘The indicative housing figures for the Districts in the Cambridge Sub-Region are based in whole (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire) or in part (East Cambridgeshire, Fenland and Huntingdonshire) on the forecast capacity for development across the whole

⁷ The figure of 30% should be reviewed and amended in the light of the Sub-Regional Housing Needs Study.

of the Sub-Region, in accordance with the development sequence set out in Policy P1/1. Should monitoring demonstrate that any stages in the development sequence are significantly under-achieving on what the Plan anticipates, then the housing figures for the whole of the development sequence in the Cambridge Sub-Region will be reviewed and the housing figures for each District amended as necessary in accordance with Policy P1/1. The mechanism for undertaking such a review will be the Stakeholder Partnership’.

Amend references to affordable and key worker housing in paragraph 9.18 to accord with the proposed changes to the policy.

MARKET TOWNS (Policies P9/5 and P9/6)

- 7.46 Policy P9/5 sets out the strategy for dealing with the Market Towns in the Cambridge Sub-Region, based upon the role identified for them in the locational strategy in Policy P1/1. Emphasis is placed on the expansion of employment in order to improve the balance of homes and jobs and to assist with the expansion of high technology or business clusters. Towns with particular potential for residential development are identified as Huntingdon and St. Neots and to a lesser extent Ely. Chatteris is separately identified in Policy P9/6 as a priority for economic regeneration, where further housing allocations will be dependent on improving job prospects.
- 7.47 As indicated in Chapter 2 of this Report, there were no objections to the status accorded in Policy P1/9 to Huntingdon, St. Neots and Ely as key Market Towns. Each of these is of substantial size (between 13,500 and 26,500 population), and each acts as an important employment and service centre for its surrounding area. This role is mirrored in Policy P9/5 and the Panel fully endorses the position adopted by the Structure Plan for these three towns.
- 7.48 The position in respect of Chatteris is somewhat different and, in our view, rather more marginal. It is accorded the same status in Policy P1/1 as Huntingdon, St. Neots and Ely, as well as Wisbech and March. However, at 8,820 population, it is much smaller than any of these towns and has a relatively small retail centre.⁸ In terms of its general size and characteristics it is rather more akin to Ramsey and some participants, understandably, suggested that it should be identified in the same category, namely as a place where development ‘on a lesser scale’ should be encouraged.
- 7.49 However, the key difference between Chatteris and Ramsey is that Chatteris is strategically better located, at the junction of the A141 and A142, with good accessibility southwards to Huntingdon and Ely, and thence to Cambridge, and northwards to March and Wisbech. It is quite well placed, therefore, to perform the function identified in the Structure Plan as a ‘stepping stone’ for spreading the economic benefits of the ‘Cambridge Phenomenon’ northwards towards the Fens. For this reason we have endorsed the identification of Chatteris as a strategic employment location (see Chapter 4).
- 7.50 We note also the aspirations of Chatteris Town Council, supported by Fenland District Council, to promote the growth of the town, ultimately to a population of 20,000. It is hoped that this will support a much wider range of employment, services and facilities. We do not under-estimate the difficulties of achieving this goal and, in our view, it is

⁸ Technical Report Supplement, Section 6, October 2002 (CD 1.3.1).

likely to take some time. Nevertheless, we were told of a number of economic initiatives, including a successful bid to EEDA for funding for employment land and infrastructure improvements, as well as evidence of recent employment growth, which give cause for encouragement.

- 7.51 We accept that it is important for the Structure Plan to support the momentum for economic growth which appears to be building up and not to signal any downgrading in the status accorded to Chatteris. For this reason we are not recommending any change to the reference to Chatteris in Policy P1/1 and we endorse the identification of the town as a priority for economic regeneration in Policy P9/6.
- 7.52 However, we do think that it is most important that any further significant residential development should be kept in balance with the growth of employment. Otherwise additional housing will tend to exacerbate long distance commuting to neighbouring Market Towns and to Cambridge. We therefore support the qualification in Policy P9/6 that further housing allocations will be dependent on improving jobs prospects. In response to discussion at the EIP on this matter, the SPAs produced a set of trigger mechanisms which could be used to monitor progress on the future scale and speed of economic regeneration (SPA Supplement 33). The suggested triggers are: a significant rise in local employment; a fall in unemployment comparative to national levels; increased representation in growth sectors of the economy; and commitment from EEDA to support employment initiatives. We do not think it is necessary to incorporate these criteria into the policy itself but it will be helpful to include them in the supporting text. It will be a matter for the Local Plan to interpret this guidance by specifying the circumstances in which particular housing land allocations should be brought forward. We have indicated earlier that 500 dwellings of the 1,500 allocated to Fenland District in Policy P9/2 should be clearly identified as contingent upon achieving a satisfactory level of employment growth.

RECOMMENDATION 7C

No change to Policies P9/5 and P9/6.

Amend the supporting text to Policy P9/6 at paragraph 9.38 to incorporate the guidance in SPA Supplement 33 specifying the trigger mechanisms to be used in connection with the release of additional housing land at Chatteris.

SELECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF EMPLOYMENT (Policy P9/8)

- 7.53 As part of the strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region, Policy 26 of RPG6 requires that *'Development Plans should continue to include policies for the selective management of development within the area close to Cambridge, discriminating in favour of uses that have an essential need for a Cambridge location'*. This policy is reflected in the Structure Plan in Policy P9/8 which requires new employment proposals in and close to Cambridge to demonstrate that they fall within one or more of the following categories:
- (a) high technology and related research and development industries and services which can show a need to be closely related to the University or other research facilities or associated services in the Cambridge area;

- (b) other industries which would contribute to a greater range of local employment opportunities;
- (c) provision of office or other development providing an essential service to Cambridge as a local or sub-regional centre.

The last paragraph of the policy indicates that employment development in the Cambridge Sub-Region will only be considered outside these categories in relation to other policies for the Market Towns and the Strategic Employment Location at Alconbury.

7.54 A number of issues were raised by participants concerning whether:

- it is sufficiently clear to which area the policy applies;
- the policy properly allows for the continued growth of the ‘Cambridge Phenomenon’;
- the policy as worded would undermine the selective management of development required by Policy 26 of RPG6;
- the policy should reflect the role of Cambridge as a regional centre.

7.55 In the light of the issues raised, the SPAs produced suggested changes to sub-paragraph b) of the policy and to paragraphs 9.41, 9.44 and 9.46 of the text (SPA Supplement 18). We consider these below. We were also offered a much simplified policy but we do not feel that this is sufficiently comprehensive to meet the needs of the Structure Plan.

Clarity of the Policy

7.56 There was some doubt raised as to whether the policy is intended to relate to the whole of the Cambridge Sub-Region. As it stands, the policy is confusing as the first part clearly relates solely to the area in or close to Cambridge whilst the last paragraph appears to be intended to cover the rest of the Sub-Region. The SPAs confirmed that it is not the intention to seek the selective management of employment growth across the whole Sub-Region. Indeed, the ‘stepping-stone’ approach seeks to spread the benefits of the Cambridge experience by encouraging employment development to move outwards from Cambridge to the edges of the Sub-Region, such as to Chatteris. On this basis, it would seem to be both inappropriate and unnecessary for the last paragraph to be included in the policy. The cross-references it contains to Policies P9/5, P9/6 and P9/2 would be more usefully included in the supporting text at paragraph 9.45.

7.57 It was suggested that the term ‘*close to Cambridge*’ might be defined in the Plan. In our view, the Structure Plan is not the appropriate place to define the term, but, for clarity, it should be defined in Local Plans or their successors. In the preparation of such plans LPAs will need to interpret the phrase in the context of the purpose of the policy and to the fact that selective management of employment development is not intended to apply across the whole of the Sub-Region. This can be made clear in the supporting text to the policy.

7.58 We find that the first paragraph of the policy, as worded, does not make clear what it is that the policy is seeking to achieve. The text in the first sentence of paragraph 9.44 seems to do this rather more clearly and might usefully be incorporated in the policy. The SPAs’ proposed changes to paragraph 9.44 which seek to clarify the importance of educational and associated research institutes to the Region were generally supported by participants. However, we believe that this should form part of the policy and not the

supporting text, to provide a clear policy framework for the preparation of policies and proposals at the local level.

- 7.59 As to what the rest of paragraph 9.44 should say, our attention was drawn to Policy SP18/4 of the existing Structure Plan which sets out a similar approach to the selective management of employment development. In this regard, there is some continuity with the present strategy which might usefully be reflected in paragraph 9.44. Thus, the first sentence in paragraph 9.44 should explain the reason for the policy, referring to the continuing development pressures on Cambridge, leading to the need to maintain the policy of selective management of growth by discriminating in favour of employment uses which have an essential need for a Cambridge location.
- 7.60 Finally, we agree with the suggestion made by a participant that the phrase '*closely related to*' in sub-paragraph a) is not as clear in spatial terms as '*located close to*'. Although we note that the former phrase is the same as that in existing Policy SP18/4, we recommend the change in wording for greater clarity in the policy. It was also suggested by another participant that the word '*primarily*' be deleted. However, this would make the policy less flexible.

Impact on the 'Cambridge Phenomenon'

- 7.61 It was put to us that relating proposals to research and development (R&D) could be misleading as many of the businesses which have sprung up in the Cambridge area are not direct spin-offs from R&D. In fact only about 25% are true R&D. It is argued that the 75% of businesses which are not R&D have driven the growth of the 'Cambridge Phenomenon' and that the policy risks driving this type of development away from the Cambridge area. The importance of co-location was emphasised, as these businesses tend to use the same labour market. In our view, the concerns of the biotech and related industries are unfounded given that this policy is doing no more than continue the policy approach of the existing Structure Plan. This approach has enabled the growth of the industries which form the 'Cambridge Phenomenon'.
- 7.62 Particular concern was expressed by those representing the biotech and other high technology industries that the policy might prevent the development of 'spin-off' businesses and 'grow-on space'. We were told about the changing nature of the high technology and related industries, many of which are moving on from research and development into manufacturing. Whilst we understand that pilot manufacturing falls within the definition of research and development, and this might be made clear in the supporting text to the policy, we see no special need for large-scale manufacturing to be accommodated in the Cambridge area. It does not seem to us that there is the same argument for propinquity associated with the manufacturing end of the process as there is for the R&D end. As such, any spin-off development could arguably be accommodated elsewhere in the Sub-Region, e.g. the Market Towns, or elsewhere in the Structure Plan area, eg Peterborough or North Cambridgeshire, where a wider range of employment development is to be encouraged. In this way, the continuum sought by the University, of research through to development and on to manufacture could be achieved without putting undue pressure on the labour market in the immediate Cambridge area.
- 7.63 We note that sub-paragraph a) of the policy does not seek to limit the size of appropriate proposals so there is no impediment in principle to a development which meets the terms of sub-paragraph a). The size limit proposed for sub-paragraph b) relates to other types of

industry and this should not, therefore, have a direct impact on the continued growth of the ‘Cambridge Phenomenon’.

- 7.64 In relation to cluster development, which is covered by Policy P9/7, the SPAs propose additional text for paragraph 9.41 to clarify that Policy P9/3c provides scope for the co-location of uses as sought by the University and Addenbrooke’s (SPA Supplement 18). Additionally, a further paragraph to follow paragraph 9.41 is proposed. This would highlight the national significance of the biotechnology and related activities based at the Brabham Institute and the Genome Campus, Hinxton, and their role as key drivers of activity in the Sub-Regional bio-technology cluster. We support these additions to the supporting text which should help to reassure the biotechnology industries, in particular, that the Plan does not intend to hinder the appropriate growth and development of this sector.

Effectiveness of the Policy

- 7.65 There was concern that sub-paragraph b) of the policy might have the effect of undermining the selective management approach because it does not seek to limit the scale of ‘*other industries*’. Policy SP18/4 of the present Structure Plan refers to ‘*other small industries*’ (our underlining) which is defined as relating to a guideline of 1,850 square metres. We agree with the SPAs that allowing an unfettered approach to ‘other industries’ would be likely to put undue pressure on scarce land resources in the Cambridge area and lead to further housing pressure, undermining the reasons behind the selective approach. Thus, in principle, we support the SPAs’ proposal to change this part of the policy (SPA Supplement 18).
- 7.66 However, we suggest that the term ‘*small-scale developments*’ is used to define the ‘*other industries*’ in sub-paragraph b), rather than including the SPAs’ proposed phrase ‘*on a limited scale*’. This would be consistent with the terminology which the SPAs suggest be inserted into paragraph 9.46 of the explanatory text. We support the insertion of this additional text which both clarifies the reason for the limitation and defines the term ‘small-scale’ developments as meaning 1,850 square metres or less. We were told that this guideline is also included in the current Cambridge Local Plan.

Role of Cambridge

- 7.67 The City Council are keen to see the role of Cambridge as a regional centre reflected in the policy. However, the role of Cambridge within the Region is a matter which needs to be considered in the context of the Region as a whole and not determined through this Structure Plan. We agree with GO-East that the proper forum for a debate on the future role of Cambridge within the Region is through RPG14. We note that there are a number of regional offices located in Cambridge such as GO-East, EEDA and English Heritage, so the lack of any reference to Cambridge as a regional centre in the current Structure Plan⁹ has not hitherto prevented such development. Moreover, the text of the Plan at paragraph 9.44 already makes it clear that ‘*exceptionally, office style employment serving a regional function may be located in the Sub-Region*’. In our view, this is appropriate for the role of Cambridge as currently defined. The SPAs propose to further clarify the types of office development which would not be appropriate, such as call centres or new language schools, because they are considered to add to the pressures on the Sub-Region

⁹ Policy SP18/5 of the 1995 Structure Plan deals with offices.

without having a real need for such a location (SPA Supplement 18). We support the inclusion of this additional text.

RECOMMENDATION 7D

Modify Policy P9/8 as follows:

- **Replace the first paragraph with the following:**
‘Employment land in and close to Cambridge will be reserved for development which can demonstrate a clear need to be located in the area in order to serve local requirements or contribute to the continuing success of the Sub-Region as a centre of high technology and research. Development proposals must demonstrate that they fall into one or more of the following categories:’
- **Replace the words ‘closely related to’ with the words ‘located close to’ in sub-paragraph a) and add after ‘research and development’ the words ‘including development of D1 educational uses and associated sui generis research institutes’;**
- **Insert the words ‘small-scale development in’ between ‘other’ and ‘industries’ in sub-paragraph b);**
- **Delete the last paragraph in the policy.**

Replace the first sentence in paragraph 9.44 with the following: *‘Development pressures close to Cambridge are expected to remain intense so there is a need to maintain the policy of selective management of growth by discriminating in favour of uses which have an essential need for a Cambridge location. Local Planning Authorities when preparing their local plans or successor documents should define the phrase ‘close to’ in the context of the purpose of the policy and to the fact that selective management of employment development is not intended to apply across the whole of the Sub-Region.’*

Insert the additional text set out in SPA Supplement 18 to support Policies P9/7 and P9/8, other than the reference to D1 educational uses etc, which should be included in the policy itself (see above). Make it clear in the text that pilot manufacturing forms part of research and development.

Relocate the cross-references to Policies P9/5, P9/6 and P2/3 contained in the last paragraph of the policy to the supporting text at paragraph 9.45.

CHAPTER 8

GREEN BELT

- 8.1 Policies P9/3a, P9/3b and P9/3c are a suite of policies dealing with the purposes of the Green Belt, principles for the review of Green Belt boundaries and the location and phasing of land to be released from the Green Belt.

VISION AND PURPOSE (Policy P9/3a)

- 8.2 Policy P9/3a sets out the purposes of the Green Belt around Cambridge as defining the extent of its urban growth, preserving its unique character, maintaining the quality of its setting and preventing communities from merging into one another and with Cambridge. The policy sets out the nature of development which would be appropriate in the Green Belt and requires LPAs to jointly draw up strategies for the active management of the Green Belt.

Vision

- 8.3 Policy 24 of RPG6 sets the framework for the approach to the Green Belt to be addressed in the Plan. This requires a review of the Cambridge Green Belt to be carried out and any changes to its boundaries to be included in development plans. The policy states that *'the review should start from a vision of the city and the qualities to be safeguarded'*. This is partly addressed in paragraph 9.24 of the Plan which sets out how the SPAs see the future form of Cambridge, although it does not expressly set out a vision. At the EIP, in response to suggestions by participants that the Plan should include a vision, the SPAs submitted SPA Supplement 7 which provides a diagrammatic interpretation of their vision of the city.
- 8.4 It was suggested to us that the approach taken by the Landscape Design Associates (LDA) in their study for South Cambridgeshire¹ would meet the intention of Policy 24 of RPG6. In this study LDA reflect on the vision for the original Green Belt which was defined by Holford and Wright in 1950. Whilst recognising that the Holford and Wright report is outdated, LDA conclude that the essential vision of Cambridge as a compact and contained city is as appropriate today as it was in 1950, albeit the size of the city is larger than that envisioned by Holford and Wright.
- 8.5 There is a fundamental difference of opinion between the City Council and South Cambridgeshire, the two LPAs who have a direct influence on the future form and shape of the city, as to what the vision for the city should be. On the one hand, South Cambridgeshire see the Green Belt as defining the 'compact city' whilst, on the other, the City suggest that to continue the Holford vision would lead to economic stagnation. This conflict is exemplified by the opposing approaches taken by each LPA to the proposed expansion to the east of Cambridge Airport which we deal with a little later in this chapter.
- 8.6 The Panel is not convinced that the key element of the Holford vision, ie the compact city, is outdated or that it is unsustainable. We note that the recently produced Cambridge

¹ Cambridge Green Belt Study (CD2.9)

Landscape Assessment describes Cambridge as ‘*a compact city with a strong sense of identity*’². As we see it, the vision of the compact city with its necklace of villages does not need to be incompatible with the ability of the Sub-Region to deliver the housing needed to redress the current imbalance between jobs and housing, whilst maintaining economic growth and continuing to develop the centres of excellence in tertiary education and research which are fundamental to the quality of Cambridge as a dynamic but historic city.

- 8.7 As indicated in Chapter 7, we are aware that this Plan should ‘*allow scope for, rather than constrain, continuing development beyond 2016*’ within the Cambridge Sub-Region (Policy 21 RPG6). However, we do not believe that this means that Cambridge City should continue to grow by peripheral expansion into the long term if such growth would be incompatible with maintaining the essential characteristics and qualities of the city. Our view is that the vision of a compact city is critical to preserving its unique qualities, even if this results in the need to accommodate longer-term growth elsewhere in the Cambridge Sub-Region.
- 8.8 We see the relationship between the city’s historic core, its peripheral development and the countryside, which provides a wider setting to the city and penetrates into its core, as fundamental to its unique character. These are the elements which we consider need to be reflected in the vision and qualities to be protected. The concept of the four expanded communities, which will deliver the growth which the city needs to accommodate to deliver a balanced community in a thriving economy, is the approach adopted by this Structure Plan to the delivery of this vision. We believe that this approach would be consistent with the vision identified in the Buchanan Study³ in their overall theme for Cambridge of ‘*a Central and Expanded Urban Hub*’ in which ‘*Historic Cambridge will be the focus for an expanded 21st century city, but maintain its intimate character, historic features heritage and good quality*’ (paragraph 3.5.3).
- 8.9 In terms of what the Plan should say, we consider that the ‘vision’ part of paragraph 9.24 should be combined with the description in the LDA study of the ‘compact city’, which is also recognised as a dynamic city. Thus, the vision for Cambridge is of a ‘*compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre*’. As to the qualities to be safeguarded, apart from its unique historic character, of particular importance to the quality of the city are the green spaces within it, the green corridors which run from open countryside into the urban area, and the green separation which exists to protect the integrity of the necklace of villages. All of these features, together with views of the historic core, are key qualities which are important to be safeguarded in any review of Green Belt boundaries. All of this could usefully be put at the beginning of the Green Belt section to provide a clear starting point for the future Green Belt reviews. We suggest the diagrammatic interpretation of this, as shown in SPA Supplement 7 (suitably amended to delete the expanded community to the east of Cambridge Airport⁴), be included as part of the Key Diagram as it represents a fundamental part of the strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region.

Purpose

- 8.10 There was much discussion at the EIP about whether the policy properly reflected the purposes of a Green Belt as set out in PPG2 and we were offered an alternative policy

² Page 1 Executive Summary Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment Draft August 2002 (CD1.28).

³ Cambridge Sub Region Study (CD2.1)

⁴ See later under Locations – East of Cambridge.

wording. It is not the role of the Structure Plan simply to reiterate national policy - it should interpret national policy as it relates to the strategic or local context. In the case of Cambridge it only has a Green Belt because it is a historic city. It follows that all five purposes of Green Belts as set out in paragraph 1.5 of PPG2 are not necessarily relevant to this Green Belt.

8.11 The Steering Group for the Sub-Regional Study agreed that there are two purposes which are critical to the Cambridge Green Belt (paragraph 7.2.7 CD 2.1):

- Primary purpose: *'To preserve the special character of Cambridge and to maintain the quality of its setting.'* This is the same as the main aim of the Cambridge Green Belt Local Plan⁵.
- Secondary purpose: *'To prevent further coalescence of settlements'*. This is one of the specific aims of the Cambridge Green Belt Local Plan.

These purposes seem to us to reflect the qualities which we identify as special to Cambridge and which need to be protected.

8.12 It was suggested to us that use of the phrase in Policy P9/3a of *'defining the extent of its urban growth'* is not an appropriate interpretation of the purpose in PPG2 *'to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas'*. In our opinion the two are not incompatible. The intention of Green Belt policy is spelt out in paragraph 1.4 of PPG2. Whilst the *'fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open'*, Green Belts *'can shape patterns of urban development'* and *'help to ensure that development occurs in locations allocated in local plans'* and they *'can assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development'*.

8.13 In requiring a review of the Green Belt around Cambridge, RPG6 refers to the identified *'conflict between the Cambridge Green Belt on its existing boundaries and sustainable patterns of development and movement'* (paragraph 5.15). The *'substantial shift from existing policies'* required by RPG6 (paragraph 5.16) leads to the need to focus development so far as possible on the city and its environs. Thus, we see one of the purposes of the Green Belt around Cambridge as shaping the patterns of development which will be required during this Plan period and beyond to meet the needs of the city, so far as this is compatible with other Green Belt purposes. Accordingly, the Green Belt will define the extent of the growth of Cambridge. It would be clearer if that is how it is expressed in the policy.

8.14 In conclusion, we see no need to fundamentally change Policy P9/3a in the ways suggested to us, although we suggest that it might be set out in a clearer way. It is also important that the policy reflects the vision of Cambridge as *'a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre'* to guide the review of Green Belt boundaries under Policy P9/3b. We were asked to consider whether the policy should require the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the setting of the city. We see this as a beneficial addition to the policy given the opportunity afforded to achieve this through planned urban extensions.

8.15 We were also asked to include *'institutions standing in large grounds'* as appropriate development to allow for the growth of high technology clusters presently located in the Green Belt. This would not accord with PPG2. Advice on the future of major developed sites in the Green Belt is given at Annex C to PPG2. There is no need to repeat this

⁵ As set out in paragraph 1.17 (CD2.8)

guidance in the Structure Plan. Any very special circumstances relating to the expansion of any of the high tech institutions would need to be justified on their individual merits, as they have been up until now, and in the context of Policy P2/4. We have seen and heard nothing to suggest to us that the economic future of these institutions is being hampered by Green Belt policy in this area.

RECOMMENDATION 8A

Include at the beginning of the section on the Green Belt the following vision of the city and the qualities to be safeguarded:

‘The vision for Cambridge is of a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre. Apart from its unique historic character, of particular importance to the quality of the city are the green spaces within it, the green corridors which run from open countryside into the urban area, as indicated on the Key Diagram, and the green separation which exists to protect the integrity of the necklace of villages. All of these features, together with views of the historic core, are key qualities which are important to be safeguarded in any review of Green Belt boundaries.’

Revise paragraph 9.24 by deleting the second sentence and replacing it with the following and relocate the paragraph to follow the vision:

‘This Plan provides for three expanded communities within the context of the overall vision. These are focussed on the University in West/North-West Cambridge, on Addenbrooke’s in the south and on the airport site to the east. A fourth expanded community focussed on the Northern Fringe is already committed.’

Incorporate into the Key Diagram the diagrammatic vision shown on SPA Supplement 7 suitably amended to delete the expanded community to the east of Cambridge Airport and to more accurately reflect the locations of the expanded communities and the green corridors.

Redraft the first paragraph of Policy P9/3a as follows:

‘A Green Belt will be maintained around Cambridge which will define the extent of urban growth. The purposes of this Green Belt are to:

- *preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre;*
- *maintain and enhance the quality of its setting;*
- *prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the city.’*

PRINCIPLES FOR RELEASE (Policy P9/3b)

8.16 Policy P9/3b requires LPAs to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt in accordance with Policy P9/3c on the basis of three principles:

- retain any areas required for the essential purposes of the redefined Green Belt as set out in Policy P9/3a;

- provide green separation between existing villages and any urban expansion of Cambridge;
- ensure protection of green corridors.

The policy also requires LPAs to review the outer boundary of the Green Belt which will be extended in the vicinity of Oakington to prevent coalescence with the proposed new settlement.

8.17 As a result of the representations made and the discussion on this topic the SPAs agreed a number of changes:

- deletion of the word '*redefined*' in the first bullet point. This is a sensible amendment to the policy which, as written, is confusing.
- deletion of the word '*essential*' before '*purposes*' – it was intended to refer to the two essential purposes of the Green Belt as defined in the Buchanan Study. However, as Policy P9/3b refers to the purposes as set out in Policy P9/3a the word '*essential*' is redundant.
- to add '*in the context of sustainable development and planned settlement form*' to the end of the first bullet point. PPG2 requires LPAs when drawing Green Belt boundaries to '*take account of the need to promote sustainable development*' (paragraph 2.10). We agree that this should form one of the principles for the release of Green Belt land.
- delete the last paragraph of the policy and include a reference to the need to have regard to new settlement proposals in the penultimate paragraph. In relation to new settlement proposals, it is not necessarily helpful or appropriate for the policy to single out the extension of the outer boundary of the Green Belt around Oakington, as there may be a need to redefine the outer boundary in relation to the new settlement proposals more generally.
- insertion of text to allow for boundary amendments to accommodate limited development in identified Rural Centres. This would accord with the modifications we propose to Policy P1/1.

There was a general consensus in support of all these changes.

8.18 Our attention was drawn to the requirement in Policy 24 of RPG6 to 'review' the Green Belt first and then consider whether any locations which do not contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt and can be released, are suitable for development. We agree that it would be appropriate for Policy P9/3b to expressly require a review of the Green Belt but we accept that the process of identifying general locations for the release of land for development has been carried out as part of this Structure Plan. Subject to our conclusions on the particular locations identified in Policy P9/3c, we see no reason to depart from the requirement in Policy P9/3b that LPAs look to release land for possible future development in particular locations, as set out in Policy P9/3c.

8.19 The Panel agree with those who suggested that the principles for release are incomplete. Clearly, they need to properly reflect both the purposes of the Green Belt and the vision. In our view, by singling out the principles of maintaining green separation and green corridors the policy fails to achieve the clarity that the SPAs are seeking. We take the view that the vision of Cambridge as a compact city and the need to maintain views of the historic core must each form one of the principles.

- 8.20 However, we see no need for the policy to refer expressly to the openness of the green corridors and the areas of green separation between settlements. It is assumed by the SPAs that these areas would be retained in the Green Belt and openness is a fundamental requirement of any land in the Green Belt. It would be helpful, however, for the supporting text to make the SPAs' intention clear. As to the width of such areas, it will be for the LPAs in determining the boundaries of the Green Belt to ensure that green corridors and areas providing green separation are of sufficient width that the purposes of the Green Belt, to prevent coalescence and maintain the setting of the city, are achieved.
- 8.21 We do not support the suggestion that there should be some form of 'greenfield swap' to provide land for recreational purposes. Any land to be included in the Green Belt as a result of the review of its outer boundaries should only be included to meet the purposes of the Green Belt as defined in Policy P9/3a. Recreational use is not one of those purposes. However, once land has been included it would be appropriate for such land to have a positive role in meeting the recreational needs of the city, in accordance with the advice in PPG2 paragraph 1.6. The last paragraph of Policy P9/3a requires LPAs *'to draw up strategies for the active management of the Green Belt'* for, amongst other things, *'outdoor recreation'*. In our view, this accords with the advice in PPG2 and there is no need for any further change to the policy in this regard.
- 8.22 An argument was presented to us that good design can, in many instances, protect the integrity of settlements making it unnecessary to require green separation. High quality design is critical to ensuring that the proposed new communities can be satisfactorily assimilated into the character of the city. Policy P1/3 requires this. However, we believe that green spaces, green corridors and green separation are such key qualities of the city and its setting that these must form part of the fundamental principles for the release of Green Belt land.

RECOMMENDATION 8B

Redraft Policy P9/3b as follows:

'Local Planning Authorities will carry out a review of the Green Belt in their areas to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in the locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/3c.'

In determining the boundaries of the areas to be released from the Green Belt the Local Planning Authorities will:

- *retain any areas required to maintain the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in Policy P9/3a in the context of delivering sustainable development and planned settlement form;*
- *have regard to the compact form of the city;*
- *provide green separation between existing settlements and any urban expansion of Cambridge to maintain the identity of the individual settlements;*
- *ensure the protection of green corridors running from open countryside into the urban area as generally indicated on the Key Diagram;*
- *maintain views of the historic core;*

- *provide, where appropriate, for limited development in identified Rural Centres in accordance with Policy P1/1.*

The Local Planning Authorities will review the outer boundary of the Green Belt to determine if additional areas can be identified which serve the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt and should be included within it, having regard to new settlement proposals.'

Revise paragraph 9.26 to reflect the up-to-date position and include the following within any redrafted text: 'It is expected that the green corridors and green separation referred to in Policy P9/3b will be retained within the Green Belt'.

LOCATION AND PHASING (Policy P9/3c)

- 8.23 Policy P9/3c sets out the location and phasing of development land to be released from the Green Belt. It requires strategic Masterplans to be prepared for the southern fringe of the city and for the eastern sector as a whole. Phasing policies are to be included in Local Plans and land not required for development before 2016 is to be safeguarded.

Format of Policy

- 8.24 We find the layout of this policy rather confusing as it contains a number of different elements which are not always set out in the most logical order. Accordingly, we have re-ordered the policy and inserted sub-headings to aid clarity. We also think it helpful for the policy to refer to the fact that the identified areas will help to deliver the vision of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city.

General

- 8.25 Some participants thought that the policy is too locationally specific. This policy is unusual in that it gives very clear guidance to the LPAs as to where they should be looking to release land from the Green Belt. We heard a great deal at the EIP about the urgency of delivering the change in strategy required by RPG6. It is essential that major development, such as that proposed for the edge of Cambridge, be brought forward through the Development Plan system. However, the significant increase in build rate required in the Cambridge Sub-Region and the need for an early start to be made in redirecting the strategy to focus on meeting the needs of Cambridge in a more sustainable way, means that the Development Plan system must deliver an early outcome on the Green Belt review and the land to be released. In our view, this justifies the general approach of Policy P9/3c in defining locations where meeting the needs of Cambridge in a sustainable way need not compromise the purposes of the Green Belt.
- 8.26 As to the basis for the locations chosen, the Buchanan Study carried out an independent appraisal of the options for development and included a Green Belt Review which considered '*the role of the Green Belt adjoining and close to the urban edge, in line with the preferred sequence of Regional Planning Guidance*' (paragraph 7.1.2). The Study was managed by a Steering Group comprising officers from all of the LPAs⁶ and it assessed '*32 Green Belt sites around the inner boundary and 31 other Green Belt sites*' (paragraph 7.3.5). This comprehensive work, carried out with the involvement of all of

⁶ Including from this area Cambridgeshire County, Cambridge City, South Cambridgeshire, East Cambridgeshire, Fenland and Huntingdonshire.

the affected LPAs, helped to inform the Structure Plan. Whilst we note that there is some disagreement over the precise locations chosen by the SPAs (a matter we deal with later), we are satisfied that this rigorous approach provides justification for the principle of specifying locations in Policy P9/3c.

Phasing

- 8.27 We have concluded on Policy P9/2 that Supplementary Planning Guidance should be prepared to give guidance on the phasing of housing development. We do not find the criteria for phasing as set out in Policy P9/3c to be helpful, indeed many participants seemed to find them confusing. In our view, it is sufficient for this policy simply to refer to phasing policies being set out in Local Plans in accordance with Policy P9/2. We note the concern of the SPAs that sites should not come forward unless any infrastructure requirements relating to the wider area can be delivered. However, this is a matter which could be addressed through masterplanning. Any additional guidance which the SPAs wish to give on phasing might be covered in the proposed Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Masterplanning

- 8.28 Some participants felt that there was a need for a Strategic Masterplan for the North West area as well as for the East and the South West. The Panel does not see that this level of masterplanning is needed for this sector for three reasons:
- there is not the same level of interdependence between the two locations in the North West sector as there is between the locations in the Eastern and Southern sectors, in particular in relation to access and transportation. Issues relating to the transport infrastructure required for these locations could be dealt with through an Area Transport Plan (see our conclusions on the North West sector below);
 - the proposed developments are not on a similar scale; the Huntingdon Road/Histon Road location, in particular, is relatively modest in scale;
 - the requirement to develop a 'strategic' Masterplan could cause difficulties because the delivery timescale for the two identified locations are likely to be different as the release of the Madingley Road/Huntingdon Road location is dependent on the University demonstrating a clear need (see below).

Nevertheless, each location will need to have regard to the other, to any other relevant developments in the area and to the need for community facilities and services when the individual Masterplans are prepared. We propose that this is clarified in the supporting text to the policy.

- 8.29 The Panel are recommending that the location West of Trumpington Road be included in the policy (see below). However, we have insufficient information on the potential interrelationships between this location and the rest of the south and south west locations to advise the SPAs as to whether this should be included in the strategic masterplanning for these locations. The SPAs will need to consider the implications of our proposed additional location before they publish their modifications. Whatever they decide, the policy needs to make it clear that in any masterplan for this location particular attention will need to be paid to the need to protect the quality and character of Grantchester Meadows.

- 8.30 We see no need for the policy to spell out who would actually prepare the strategic masterplans. This matter can be covered adequately in the supporting text as it is a matter of process rather than policy. We support giving encouragement to consulting with local resident groups but again this is a matter to be included in the supporting text. We also agree with those who pointed out the importance to the delivery of the strategy of carrying out the preparation of strategic masterplans in parallel with the local plan process, to minimise delays in delivering housing in accordance with the Development Plan allocations. We think it helpful for the Plan to explain the difference between Strategic Masterplans, Masterplans and Design Frameworks and we have drafted some text to achieve this.

PLAN PREPARATION

- 8.31 Given the interrelationship between the release of the various Green Belt locations and the delivery of the strategy of the Plan we strongly recommend that a joint Green Belt Local Plan or appropriate document under the revised Development Plan system is prepared. This will enable the two main LPAs, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire, to achieve consistency in the definition of the Green Belt boundaries and phase the release of the sites to make the best use of infrastructure and to meet the build rate required to deliver the aims of the strategy.

LOCATIONS

East Cambridge

- 8.32 This is the most controversial of the three locations identified in the draft Structure Plan. Three separate areas are identified for development in this Plan period:

- North of Newmarket Road;
- North of Cherry Hinton - at the EIP the SPAs proposed to add 'and east';
- Cambridge Airport.

A further area has been proposed by one of the participants, namely land at Fen Ditton. In addition, the draft Plan seeks to safeguard land to the east of the Airport for development after 2016, provided it can be developed whilst maintaining the fundamental purposes of the Green Belt.

North of Newmarket Road

- 8.33 There was little disagreement amongst participants as to the potential for land in this location to be released for development. It is well related to the compact city and to Marshalls employment area and it is located adjacent to a Park and Ride site in a transport corridor which has existing bus services. We believe that issues concerning the relationship of any development to Fen Ditton are capable of being addressed satisfactorily at the Local Plan stage. However, given our conclusions on the transportation issues in this area of Cambridge (below and in Chapter 6 of this report), we support the need for this location to be considered as part of the strategic masterplanning for the eastern sector of the city.

North and east of Cherry Hinton

- 8.34 The potential for land to the north of Cherry Hinton to be released for development was not generally disputed by participants. The location is well related to the compact city. It would represent a logical extension of the Cherry Hinton area subject to the protection of the Coldhams Common/Teversham green finger and to the transportation issues being addressed as referred to a little later.
- 8.35 As to the location east of Cherry Hinton, this was proposed to be added by the SPAs as a result of the Llewellyn Davies study⁷ which identified this area as having potential for development as part of the eastern expansion of the city. We conclude below that the longer term expansion of the city eastwards would not accord with the vision of Cambridge as a compact city. We recognise that the existing distributor road along the eastern edge of Cherry Hinton represents a clear boundary to the city, although we also note that some limited development in this location could make more efficient use of this existing infrastructure without necessarily leading to coalescence with Teversham or Fulbourn. In our view, any scope which may exist for any amendments to the Green Belt boundary in this location are not a strategic matter. Thus, we do not propose to recommend that the change proposed by the SPA be included in the Structure Plan.

Cambridge Airport

- 8.36 The Cambridge Green Belt Local Plan refers to this location as follows: *‘Together with Coldhams Common, Cambridge Airport forms part of a prominent wedge of open land which stretches into the city and as such it is appropriate for inclusion within the Green Belt. If flying ceased or runway alignments changed, or development within the safeguarding areas were to be sanctioned, the Green Belt function could be seriously undermined or lost’*⁸. We were asked to consider what had changed since that Plan was prepared.
- 8.37 The Green Belt Local Plan provisions have to be viewed in the context of the strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region as expressed in RPG6 and the need to review the function of locations on the edge of the city which lie within the Green Belt in order to deliver a more sustainable pattern of development. In that context, the Buchanan Study identified this location as having *‘potential for development following the creation of an appropriate landscape framework’*, although the study assessed the location as requiring a wide continuation of the Teversham ‘green finger’ which would limit the capacity to about 3,500 dwellings.
- 8.38 We consider that this is an important location for the strategy of the Cambridge Sub-Region. It is contained by Airport Way and reasonably well related to Cambridge in terms of the compact city, lying as it does between the developed areas of Cherry Hinton to the south and along Newmarket Road to the north. It also has the potential to enable the development of previously developed land. We note that there is general agreement amongst the relevant LPAs and their respective consultants that this is an appropriate location to consider the release of land from the Green Belt for future development. We agree with the conclusion of the Landscape Design Associates that *‘there is potential to enhance the setting and special character of the city through such development, if it is planned, designed and implemented in a sensitive manner’*⁹. In this context, any land

⁷ Eastern Cambridge Study, Llewellyn Davies in association with others (CD2.6)

⁸ Paragraph 3.31, Cambridge Green Belt Local Plan (CD2.8)

⁹ Section 7.5 page 109, Cambridge Green Belt Study (CD2.9)

release in this location will need to pay proper regard to the need to maintain the penetration of the countryside into the heart of the city provided by the Teversham green finger which links with Coldhams Common. This requirement should be made clear in the policy.

- 8.39 However, given the scale of the land potentially available, we also support the principle that this location ought to be developed at a high density to maximise its potential contribution to meeting the housing needs of the city. The precise capacity will be determined through the Local Plan process when the boundaries of the Green Belt in this location will be determined and the development principles established. However, we see no reason to disagree in principle with the SPAs' assumption that this location could ultimately accommodate in the region of 6,000 dwellings.

Timing

- 8.40 The Panel was informed that these three locations are being promoted as being in one effective ownership of which the Marshall Group are the largest landholder. In relation to north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton there would appear to be no impediment in principle to the delivery of land in these locations for development early in the Plan period.
- 8.41 However, in relation to the release of land at Cambridge Airport this is dependent upon the relocation of the airport and its associated facilities. The Marshall Group confirmed their intention to seek to move. In conjunction with EEDA, Marshalls commissioned a study¹⁰ to consider the implications of relocation, both in terms of the contribution Marshalls make to the Cambridge economy, a matter of concern both to EEDA and to other participants at the EIP, and possible relocation destinations. This report identified a number of alternative options for the relocation of the Airport and Marshalls confirmed that they have held informal and confidential discussions with owners of possible relocation sites.
- 8.42 One of the options identified in the Arup Report is Alconbury. We refer in Chapter 6 to the possible relocation of Cambridge Airport to Alconbury in the context of the SERAS Report¹¹. These proposals are controversial and at an early stage in the consultation process so can be afforded little weight in relation to this Structure Plan. We note, however, that should the Government choose to follow the SERAS approach to Alconbury, Marshalls have scrutinised the facilities and they would be content with the identification of this as a potential alternative location for the airport.
- 8.43 In their statement to the EIP Marshalls stated that they believed that development at the airport could happen 10-15 years from now. This confirmed the view of many of the participants that it is unrealistic for the SPAs to identify this location in Policy P9/3c as one to be considered for the early commencement of development. Subsequent to the debate on this matter the Panel were informed by Marshalls that their discussions on relocating the airport were making very good progress and they are confident that the airport location could be made available around 2010.
- 8.44 However, the Panel also notes that Marshalls have a current planning application for a new passenger terminal. We appreciate that, in order to protect the business, existing facilities may need to be modernised irrespective of the plans to relocate. We also note

¹⁰ Cambridge Airport Study, Arup Economics and Planning, September 2002(CD2.20)

¹¹ See our conclusions under policy P8/12

that the design of the proposed terminal is intended to be capable of adaptation to B1 uses. Nevertheless, we remain unconvinced that the timetable for relocation can be relied upon. There is, clearly, a good deal of uncertainty about the status of the Cambridge Airport location in terms of its potential contribution to the strategy during the Structure Plan period. Nevertheless, this location should be capable of accommodating the 2,500 dwellings which the SPAs have assumed could be developed within the Plan period and it provides scope for longer term development beyond 2016. In our view, these issues need to be made clear in the Plan and we recommend changes to the policy and the text to achieve this.

Transportation Matters

- 8.45 The Plan recognises the interrelationships and interdependency between these locations in requiring a strategic Masterplan to be prepared and the reason given for this was because all rely on the same transport corridor. We heard much criticism of the SPAs approach to the eastern sector of the city and, in particular, in relation to the transportation issues. We share many of the concerns raised about, for example, the scale of development proposed both here and elsewhere in the city without any clear proposals for dealing, comprehensively, with the transportation issues. In Chapter 6 we support the arguments raised which suggested that the scale of development proposed required consideration to be given to the need for some form of orbital route to link the four new communities and the major employment areas.

Land East of Cambridge Airport

- 8.46 Unlike Cambridge Airport there is no consensus between the LPAs about the proposal to safeguard land to the east of Airport Way for development after 2016. Indeed, amongst participants this proved to be the most controversial of the locations proposed in the Structure Plan. The Buchanan Study concluded that development in this location would cause coalescence between Teversham and Fulbourn and it would have a significant effect on the urban form of Cambridge.
- 8.47 Subsequent to the Buchanan Study two further studies have been carried out in relation to this location:
- DEGW were commissioned by the City Council to undertake a study testing the feasibility of an expansion to Cambridge¹². This concludes that *'the bulk of the population growth generated by Cambridge should be located within the City and its immediate surroundings'* and they put the case for eastern expansion.
 - Llewellyn Davies, in association with others, undertook a study for the County and City Councils which addressed two key issues:¹³
 - i. what is the potential location, scale and form of eastwards development; and
 - ii. where should the new Green Belt boundary be positioned. This report concluded that *'expansion eastwards offers major potential for development in a manner which:*
 - *can be a quality exemplar of sustainable urban expansion; and*

¹² DEGW Report Cambridge Urban Expansion October 2001 (CD2.6.2)

¹³ Eastern Cambridge Study September 2002 (CD2.6)

- *create a unique opportunity for the growth of the City as a regional centre'.*

- 8.48 Both of these studies seek to demonstrate how major development to the east of the airport might be accommodated in a way which maintains the integrity of the settlements of Teversham and Fulbourn and which would provide a high quality form of development. However, in doing so, we believe that the concept of the compact city would be diminished. The proposed expansion to the east of the airport is of a scale and character which is very different from the proposed urban extensions to the north-west, south/south-west and north (Cambridge Northern Fringe). Each of these areas would be reasonably well related to the existing compact urban form of the city and capable of being complementary to it.
- 8.49 Airport Way seems to us to form a very clear and logical boundary to the eastward expansion of the city. We have concluded above that development of the airport would conform with the vision of the compact city. However, lying immediately beyond Airport Way, Teversham forms one of the necklace of villages which surround Cambridge and form part of its special character. It would be effectively swallowed up by further expansion to the east of the airport, becoming part of the city rather than a distinctive settlement in its own right. As to Fulbourn, the scale of separation proposed to retain the identity of this settlement and avoid coalescence with Teversham would render the effect of the proposals to expand in this location a form of village expansion rather than urban extension. In our view, that approach is not consistent with the sequential approach required by Policy 21 of RPG6.
- 8.50 One consequence of the expansion of the city to the east would be to further unbalance the relationship between the historic core and its supporting residential and employment areas. The eastern expansion would be poorly related spatially to the centre of the city. The scale of the development proposed for this location could lead to a new focus for major services and facilities which might compete with the city centre and compromise the vision of a thriving historic centre.
- 8.51 We remain unconvinced by the transport strategy for the further expansion to the east, beyond the airport, which is based on the principle of holding car use at current levels and accommodating all future growth in traffic by increased use of walking, cycling and public transport. We accept that this approach is consistent with the objectives of the SPAs and that, at this stage, detailed transportation proposals have not been worked up. Nevertheless, we have doubts as to the realism of the Llewellyn Davies' assumptions as to the walking and cycling levels likely to be achieved from locations to the east of Airport Way, ie 37% from Teversham north and east and 28% from Fulbourn. Such levels would be dependent on achieving quite a high level of self-sufficiency in the proposed new communities as these locations are at some distance from the city centre and other major employment areas on the edge of the city. This reinforces the point made above about the potential creation of a competing centre to the east of the city.
- 8.52 We recognise in Chapter 7 and elsewhere that this Structure Plan should not constrain longer-term options for meeting the city's needs. It is also a requirement of PPG2 that any changes to Green Belt boundaries should be based on a long-term view. However, land should only be taken out of the Green Belt and safeguarded for future development if that is clearly the most appropriate of the available options for meeting the long-term needs of the city. The Llewellyn Davies study provides a comprehensive and flexible

strategy for delivering between 10,200 and 13,700 dwellings¹⁴ to meet at least some of the needs of the city over the next 30 years. However, we do not believe that these proposals would deliver the vision of the city which we have concluded ought to be reflected in the Structure Plan. In our view, they represent one, but only one, solution to the long-term needs of the city. Alternative options for meeting those needs, such as a second new settlement, have not been tested.

8.53 Furthermore, the SPAs have adopted a conservative assumption as to the dwelling capacity of the locations they propose for release from the Green Belt, assuming that 8,000 dwellings will be delivered during the Structure Plan period. This was at least in part based on the need to obtain some consensus on the scale of land release from the Green Belt to ensure a speedy delivery of the strategy. We note, however, that the Buchanan Study, which did not recommend that the city should expand eastwards beyond the airport, nevertheless found locations on the edge of the city which they felt had the capacity to accommodate 12,500 dwellings. Thus, there may well be more scope within other Green Belt areas proposed for release to accommodate some of the dwellings proposed for the eastern expansion. We have concluded elsewhere that a further location to the west of Trumpington Road ought to be added to Policy P9/3c which will increase the available opportunities to accommodate more housing on the edge of the city. We have also concluded in Chapter 9 that, of the alternative new settlement proposals we were asked to consider, Waterbeach offers the potential for longer term development. Development of a second new settlement in the longer term would not conflict with the vision of the city or the Sub-Region¹⁵.

8.54 We conclude that it would be wrong for the Structure Plan to safeguard land to the east of Cambridge Airport for longer term development post 2016 because:

- expansion beyond Airport Way to the east would be likely to compromise the vision of Cambridge as a compact city. This is a fundamental objection to the identification of this location in Policy P9/3c. In addition:
- there is no consensus that this is the appropriate option;
- alternative options, such as a second new settlement, have not been tested.

Accordingly, we do not recommend the inclusion of the new Policy P9/3d and supporting text proposed by the SPAs in their Schedule of Changes which deals expressly with land to the east of the Airport¹⁶.

Land at Fen Ditton

8.55 Land to the north and east of Fen Ditton is put forward as an alternative approach to the eastern sector on the basis that this location would:

- have no greater impact on the Green Belt and significant advantages over other eastern options;
- be located in an area of low environmental quality;
- be highly sustainable;
- facilitate orbital connections to major areas of employment;

¹⁴ Table 5.3 CD2.6

¹⁵ See Chapter 7

¹⁶ Change No 360/02 Schedule of Changes, SPA Supplement 11

- be deliverable within the Plan period.

- 8.56 We consider that, spatially, this location is reasonably well related to the Cambridge Northern Fringe and to other parts of the proposed eastern expansion to the north of Newmarket Road and, though to a lesser extent, at Cambridge Airport. It is contained by the A14 to the north and east and would generally accord with the vision of the compact city. However, significant urban expansion in this location would completely overwhelm the village of Fen Ditton which currently retains a clear separate identity as one of Cambridge's necklace of villages. The Panel is unconvinced by arguments put by the proponents of this location that the existing relationship between Fen Ditton and the city would remain unaltered. Fen Ditton would be effectively absorbed into the expanded city as it would be surrounded by major development to the north, east and south.
- 8.57 Although severed by the A14 from the wider fenland landscape to the north east, land to the north and east of Fen Ditton gives a flat, open setting to the city which is characteristic of the Fen Edge landscape. We accept that this location is not physically part of the River Cam corridor and views of the historic core of the city are limited. Nevertheless, we consider that the fenland character of the landscape in this location contributes to the Green Belt purpose of maintaining the quality of the setting of the city.
- 8.58 We note that major development in this location would provide the opportunity to carry out the management and enhancement of the landscape surrounding Fen Ditton which is recommended in the LDA Study. However, neither this nor any other benefit which this location might offer in terms of sustainable development, in our view, outweighs the likely loss of the integrity of Fen Ditton as a separate settlement which would result from such development. Moreover, enhancement of the landscape in this area does not need to be dependent on new development. In terms of impact on one of the necklace of villages which form an important part of the character and setting of Cambridge, the Panel do not see any material difference between this location and that to the east of Airport Way. We conclude that this is not a location which should accommodate major development of a strategic scale.

South / West Cambridge

- 8.59 Two locations are identified in the draft Plan in the south/southwest Cambridge sector:
- South and west of Addenbrooke's Hospital;
 - Clay Farm and areas east and south of Trumpington;
- 8.60 Two other locations have been proposed by participants:
- Land west of Trumpington Road
 - Land at Netherhall Farm

South and west of Addenbrooke's Hospital

- 8.61 This location is situated directly adjacent to the southern and western boundaries of Addenbrooke's Hospital. There are somewhat conflicting views from the recent Green Belt studies as to whether this area has any potential for development having regard to its Green Belt function. The Buchanan Report found that the land directly south of Addenbrooke's had potential for development if an appropriate landscape framework was created. However, it did not support development on land to the west, between the Hospital and the railway line, due to the open landscape character and presence of

Hobson's Brook. The LDA Study concluded, from their broad scale assessment, that there was not the opportunity for large-scale development south of Addenbrooke's Hospital. Meanwhile the David Brown Study found that development both south and west of Addenbrooke's would have an unacceptable impact and would undermine the purpose of the Green Belt.

- 8.62 Despite this, all participants generally accepted the principle of releasing land in this location from the Green Belt. It was agreed that, on balance, the expansion needs of Addenbrooke's Hospital were sufficient to override the impact of major development in this location on Green Belt purposes. We concur with this view and are satisfied that the location would conform to the vision of Cambridge as a compact city.
- 8.63 We agree that any development in this location will need to be subject to careful masterplanning and phasing of development. Of particular importance to that process is the protection of the Hobson's Brook green finger to the west. Indeed, both the Buchanan Report¹⁷ and the LDA Study¹⁸ identify the route of Hobson's Brook as a 'Green Finger' worthy of protection. The challenge to be addressed by the Masterplan will be to incorporate not just the proposed development at Addenbrooke's, but also the proposed routes of the Rapid Transit System and the access road from Hauxton Road, whilst maintaining a green finger which is of sufficient width to fulfil its purpose. However we are satisfied that meeting this challenge should not limit the potential for development in this location to the extent that it should not be included in the Plan. We are recommending a slight amendment to Policy P9/3c to refer specifically to Hobson's Brook so the green corridor referred to in the policy is entirely clear.
- 8.64 One further matter that was raised concerned the impact that additional traffic, particularly construction traffic, will have on road congestion in this area. This concern stems from SPA Supplement 17, which in the 'Draft Outline Implementation Programme', implies that the housing in the 'South and west of Addenbrooke's location' would be completed prior to the completion of the access road from Hauxton Road. The SPA confirmed that the implementation programme is a work in progress and has not yet been considered by the Stakeholder Partnership. There is therefore scope for changes to the development programme to be made if it becomes clear that major development in this location would, indeed, generate an unacceptable level of traffic congestion. In any event, this is a matter to be addressed in considering the detailed phasing of land release from the Green Belt when the precise scale of the development, its anticipated construction timescale and the impact of that on transportation in the area can be properly assessed. This level of detail goes beyond that which can or should be addressed at the strategic level.
- 8.65 In summary, we are satisfied that this is an appropriate location to include in Policy P9/3c.

Clay Farm and areas east and south of Trumpington

- 8.66 On the evidence before us and, in particular, that in the three recent studies of the Green Belt¹⁹ this location appears to be generally suitable for release. Indeed, all three studies highlight this general area as one in which development would have a low level of impact

¹⁷ Page 9-12 of Technical Papers Volume 2 (CD2.3)

¹⁸ Paragraph 5.4 and Drawing Number 1641LP/07 (CD2.9)

¹⁹ The Buchanan Report, the LDA Study and the David Brown Study

on the function of the Green Belt²⁰. We heard nothing to convince us that this was not the case and are satisfied therefore that release of land in this location would not have a significant negative impact on the purposes of the Green Belt. However, a number of further issues were raised in relation to this location and we deal with these below.

- 8.67 The first of these relates to the proximity of this location to the Green Belt release at south and west of Addenbrooke's Hospital. Indeed, this location is very close to the release at Addenbrooke's which is just to the east of the Hobson's Brook green finger. As such, the arguments above relating to the extent of the development and the retention of the green finger are also relevant to this location. There is an important relationship between the scale and extent of development in both of these areas which highlights the importance of a strategic Masterplan for the southern fringe of the city.
- 8.68 There is also a potential benefit to be gained from the proximity of this location to Addenbrooke's Hospital. It was contended that it might be possible to tie a proportion of the affordable housing nomination rights to workers at the Hospital. There were some doubts expressed as to whether this would be possible within the current affordable housing and planning obligations regimes. However, the potential sustainability benefits of doing so are such that if this could be achieved then we believe that it should be supported.
- 8.69 One participant raised concern over the proximity of this location to Junction 11 of the M11. Whilst this would enable quick and easy access onto the national road network, it would also make this location particularly attractive to those working in London or Stansted to the south. Thus, any housing here may contribute towards meeting housing needs outside the Plan area, rather than those of the Cambridge Sub-Region. We accept that the Structure Plan cannot control the occupation of future dwellings to prevent the possibility that some may lead to out-commuting. However, we are satisfied that this location is well related to the compact city and that it has the potential to assist in delivering a better balance between jobs and housing in the Sub-Region.
- 8.70 The final matter is one of detail concerning the description of this location. We are inclined to agree with GO-East that the current description in the Plan is too locationally specific for a structure plan. Indeed, the reference in the description to 'Clay Farm' in particular implies the allocation of a specific site. The deletion of the words 'Clay Farm and areas' from this description would not, in our view, harm the implementation of the policy.
- 8.71 Also in relation to the description, it was contended that the present wording could imply the development of land directly to the south of Trumpington. We agree that this could lead to a degree of confusion in the Plan. This can be resolved through a simple change in the policy, altering the word '*south*' to '*south east*'. This would represent a more accurate description of the location identified on the Key Diagram without descending into a level of detail that is inappropriate for a Structure Plan. Furthermore, this would also address concerns that development in this location could result in the coalescence of Trumpington and Great Shelford.

²⁰ See Table A on page 9-5 of the Technical Papers Volume II to the Buchanan Report (CD 2.3); paragraph 8.4 of the LDA Study (CD 2.9); and, the 'South-west Case Study' in the Cambridge Green Belt Landscape Setting Study Vol II of the David Brown Study (CD 2.9.1).

Land west of Trumpington Road

8.72 This location was suggested by South Cambridgeshire District Council as having the potential for development at an early stage in the Plan period. As a result of the discussion on this location there are three issues to address:

- the impact of the location on the setting of Cambridge;
- the effect of development in this location on Grantchester Meadows;
- the transportation implications of major development in this location.

Impact on setting of Cambridge

8.73 This location was discounted by both the Buchanan and LDA studies, both of which concluded that land in this area contributed to the setting of Cambridge. In the David Brown study, the area was identified as one in which development would have a moderate level of impact on the setting of the city with the area immediately adjacent to Trumpington Road having a low level of impact. We note that this location was also identified in the City Council's study 'Cambridge Green Belt Towards 2016' as a potential urban extension²¹. It is close to the city centre and would contribute to, rather than detract from, the vision of Cambridge as a compact city.

8.74 We found the most dominant feature of this location, as one approaches the city along Trumpington Road, is the very substantial tree belt which fringes the road on its western side. Apart from a couple of gaps where there are views across the relatively flat arable land to Grantchester, the tree belt effectively screens views westwards from the road. The east side of the road is built up and contrasts with the largely undeveloped western side. However, the effect of the tree belt is to limit the effectiveness of the openness on the western side and provide a degree of enclosure to the road. Although Trumpington Road provides one of the main gateways to the historic city, it is our opinion that the main contribution to the particular character of this gateway is provided by the tree belt and not the land beyond. This land does not provide a foreground to the historic city. In that regard, this location differs from land north of Barton Road, which we found to be critical to the setting of the historic city (see later), or land at Fen Ditton, which provides part of the fenland setting to the wider cityscape (see previously).

8.75 In our view, carefully sited and designed development to the rear of, and contained, by the tree belt need not seriously impact on the setting of the city. Very great care would be needed to ensure that, where it is necessary to punch through the tree belt to gain access, the visual containment provided by the trees is maintained as effectively as possible. However, we do not see that the design challenge of this location need be significantly greater than that posed by other locations proposed for release in the Plan.

Effect on Grantchester Meadows

8.76 Walking along the cycleway/footpath which connects Grantchester with the City centre we were aware of the views across the valley to the line of trees along Trumpington Road. It is evident that development on the flattish land which extends from Trumpington Road to the break in the slope which denotes the valley side would be visible from this location, although its impact could be softened very effectively by suitable planting on and above the valley side. We found the photomontage provided at the EIP by one participant, which presented a rather stark impression of what development might look like, to be

²¹ Fig 19 (CD2.9.2)

unrepresentative of what could be achieved by careful design and landscaping to produce a soft edge to any urban extension in this location.

- 8.77 There is a clear visual break between the valley itself forming Grantchester Meadows, which are one of the most important features of the Cambridge setting, and the agricultural land which borders Trumpington Road. This break has been described as a 'shoulder'. In our view, development in the location between the shoulder and Trumpington Road need not have any harmful effect on the quality and value of Grantchester Meadows which are contained by the valley sides. Any development beyond the shoulder would be viewed across what is quite a wide valley and it need not intrude into this corridor of countryside which penetrates the city. We see as potentially beneficial the opportunity which development in this location might have in terms of opening up the eastern side of the valley to provide greater public access.
- 8.78 As to the capacity of this location, this is a matter for the Local Plan to address. Whether or not the location could accommodate development of 1,800 dwellings, as suggested by South Cambridgeshire²², will depend on a detailed assessment of the precise boundaries of the developable area and the scope for achieving higher densities, having regard to the proximity of Trumpington Hall and to sports facilities in the area. In our view, at this stage, the Structure Plan should make only a modest allowance of about 1,000 dwellings for the capacity of the location.

Transportation issues

- 8.79 One of the main benefits of this location is its proximity to the city centre, making it highly sustainable in terms of accessibility by slow modes (walking and cycling). We were advised by the SPAs that the SATURN modelling for the Sub-Region included an element of development in this location, but there is nothing in the current package of measures related to the proposed location to the east and south east of Trumpington which would assist directly in bringing forward land to the west of Trumpington Road. The SPAs have not produced a more detailed assessment for this location as they have done for the other locations in the southern part of the city. Thus, there is insufficient information before us to assess the transportation implications of this location in terms of how, in principle, to deal with the access arrangements, the relationship of this location to the proposals to the east of Trumpington Road and the role of public transport. However, we do not see any reason why land to the west of Trumpington Road need be significantly more difficult to bring forward in transportation terms than any of the others identified in the Structure Plan. We believe it is more a question of when rather than if this location could contribute to meeting the needs of the Sub-Region.

Conclusions

- 8.80 In the light of the uncertainty which surrounds the release of Cambridge Airport for development, we share the view of many participants that, where there are other options which may have the potential to fulfil the requirements of RPG6, those opportunities ought to be identified in the Structure Plan. We believe that land to the west of Trumpington road is one such opportunity which needs further investigation by the SPAs with a view to including it in Policy P9/3c.

²² 1,800 was the figure referred to in South Cambridgeshire DC's statement but at the Examination a figure of 1,700 was mentioned.

Land at Netherhall Farm

- 8.81 This location comprises Netherhall Farm and some surrounding land adjacent to the south eastern edge of the built-up area of Cambridge. The evidence from the three main studies of the Green Belt suggests that this location is not suitable for release from the Green Belt. In the Buchanan Report this general area is identified as three separate parcels of land. The Report concludes that: *'these three sites located to the south east of Cambridge are widely visible from the Gog Magog Hills to the south. Development within these areas would have a significant effect on the existing interface between the urban edge and the countryside which contributes to the setting of Cambridge'*²³. This assessment is reiterated in the LDA Study, which refers to the elevated panoramic views of Cambridge and the value of the undeveloped rural character of the backdrop to Cambridge²⁴. The 'South-West Case Study' in the David Brown Study covers part of this general location. This study finds that development in this location would have an unacceptable impact and undermine the purposes of the Green Belt.
- 8.82 These studies consistently reject this location due to its contribution to the Green Belt. We heard nothing to persuade us to form a different view. Nor did we hear anything to convince us that there were other considerations of sufficient weight to override the harm that strategic development in this location would have on Green Belt purposes. We recognise that this location is well related to the compact city and has potential sustainability benefits due to its proximity to the proposed development to the south of Addenbrooke's Hospital. In this regard, we note the suggestion that preferential treatment might be given to key workers at the Hospital. However, we do not consider any of these matters to be sufficient to outweigh the impact on Green Belt purposes.
- 8.83 The proponents of this location claimed that there was an inconsistency in the interpretation of and weight placed on the three Green Belt studies. We do not agree that this is the case. The contribution of the land to the function of the Green Belt is just one factor to be weighed up against other considerations. Some of the other locations identified for release from the Green Belt are within areas where we recognise that major development would have an impact on the purposes of the Green Belt ie land south of Addenbrooke's and land to the north west of Cambridge. However, in these areas there are specific and overriding reasons for their release.

North West and West Cambridge

- 8.84 Two locations are identified in the draft Structure Plan for release in the North West sector of Cambridge:
- Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road;
 - Land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road.
- 8.85 Two further locations have been proposed by participants:
- Land to the north of Barton Road;
 - Land north east of Histon.

²³ Page 9-12 of Volume II of the Technical Papers (CD 2.3)

²⁴ See Area 2 on Plan 1641LP/09 (CD 2.9)

Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

- 8.86 There was general agreement amongst participants that this is a location which has potential for development subject to ensuring that the integrity of Girton village is maintained by appropriate green separation. Indeed, most seem to agree that development in this location has the potential to improve this ‘gateway’ into Cambridge and it could help to rectify deficiencies in the range of services and facilities available to the local population of NW Cambridge. Our attention was drawn to a number of detailed matters such as the need to address drainage issues and the relationship of the location to the A14. However, these are matters which should be addressed at the Local Plan stage when the detailed boundaries of the land to be released and the requirements for its development should be established.
- 8.87 The main issue in relation to this location is whether the Structure Plan should treat this as a reserve location to be brought forward *‘when required’* and whether it should be *‘subject to an assessment of the impact of transport improvements on the A14 corridor and the new settlement’*. We note that when this location was considered by the County Council it was *‘envisaged that this site could be developed in the relatively short term’*²⁵. Nevertheless, we were told by the SPAs that this location was treated as a reserve in Policy P9/3c because it was envisaged that locations to the south and east would come forward in the early part of the Plan period and that this and the neighbouring University land would not be needed until later.
- 8.88 However, it is agreed that the Airport location is not likely to come forward until towards the end of the Plan period. We have referred earlier to the urgency to raise the build rate in the Cambridge Sub-Region and to start to deliver the revised strategy required by RPG6. It would seem sensible, therefore, that, if this location could make a contribution early in the Plan period, the Structure Plan should not impose an arbitrary limitation on its ability to do so.
- 8.89 As to the relationship to the A14 improvements, and CHUMMS generally, and to the new settlement proposals, we accept that these will have an impact on transportation in this location and we note the concern of those who have drawn attention to the congestion on Histon Road. However, any development proposals in this location would be subject to a Transport Assessment which would need to have regard to other developments and transportation proposals in the area, including the new settlement proposals, the A14 improvements and the developments which are proposed in the Cambridge Northern Fringe. We do not see the need for the policy to expressly refer to this level of detail although it would be helpful to make this clear in the supporting text.
- 8.90 We appreciate that the possible release of this land early in the Plan period may require difficult decisions to be made about demand management. Nevertheless, these are issues which the County and City Councils will have to address in response to the major development proposed by the Structure Plan here and elsewhere in the Cambridge Sub-Region (see Chapter 6 of this report). Indeed, it was suggested that these are matters which should be addressed in an Area Transport Plan for this corridor.
- 8.91 We conclude that there is no reason for the Structure Plan to hold up the possible development of this location, which is agreed by the SPAs to be no less sustainable than those to the south and east.

²⁵ Strategic Planning Service Group meeting on 27 November 2001 (CD1.12)

Land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road

8.92 This location relates to land owned by the University of Cambridge. It is described as the last major land holding of the University. Unlike the land to the north-east of Huntingdon Road, this location was not considered by the Buchanan Study to have potential for development. The land is prominent, being highly visible from the west and it provides an open setting to the village of Girton, which straddles the A14. On this side of the city the approaches along both Madingley and Huntingdon Roads are relatively open and green until quite close to the central core, emphasising the compact nature of the city.

8.93 The acceptability of this location is dependent upon:

- the needs of the University;
- those needs not being capable of being met elsewhere;
- the needs outweighing the impact on the purposes of the Green Belt.

Need

8.94 The need is based on the expansion proposals of the University which are driven by the increasing national focus on higher education and on the growth in research activity which has fuelled the 'Cambridge Phenomenon'. The University anticipates staff and student numbers to increase by an average of 1.75% per annum, such that by 2025 there would be an additional 1,700 undergraduates, 3,400 postgraduates and 2,700 staff. Over the 25 year timescale 2000-2025 the University is looking to provide:

- additional research space, building on the model provided by the West Cambridge development;
- academic space, notably for the relocation of departments housed in the city centre, such as Earth Sciences;
- housing for staff, subsidised by general market housing; and
- new colleges, of which three are expected to be required by 2025.

8.95 The vision for the Cambridge Sub-Region includes the concept that it will continue to be a centre of excellence and world leader in the fields of higher education and research and it will foster dynamism, prosperity and further expansion of the knowledge-based economy (see Chapter 7). To meet this vision it can be expected that the University will continue to grow and it is appropriate that this growth should be accommodated as part of the city, so far as that is compatible with meeting the vision of the city as a compact city. On that basis, the Panel are satisfied that there is a general need for land to be available specifically for the expansion of the University.

Alternative locations

8.96 The University is currently developing the Western Campus, to the south of Madingley Road. It has been suggested that the University could accommodate many of its needs, such as for key worker housing, on or in the vicinity of the Western Campus. The Panel note that the Western Campus is some 66 hectares in area and it is proposed to accommodate mixed use, University-related development totalling 175,120 square metres. The Masterplan shows that the site is proposed to be relatively densely developed and we accept that there is little scope for accommodating the long-term needs of the University here.

- 8.97 The University carried out a study to assess the potential for accommodating their needs on land in the vicinity of the western campus²⁶. This found that land in North West Cambridge is sensitive, particularly in terms of its relationship to the village of Girton, but that land to the south of Madingley Road and north of Barton Road is more sensitive in terms of its impact on historic Cambridge. We agree with this assessment.
- 8.98 We are satisfied that there is no obvious alternative location which could meet the needs of the University for the scale of development proposed.

Justification for release of Green Belt land

- 8.99 We accept the desirability of propinquity in the context of the 'Cambridge Phenomenon', although we feel that this can be overstated in the era of advanced telecommunications. Accordingly, we do not place too much weight on the argument of proximity to the Western Campus and we do not consider this alone is sufficient justification for the release of Green Belt land.
- 8.100 We note that *'a key driver of the proposed land uses for North West Cambridge is the ability to use the land receipt to cross subsidise the provision of key worker housing, academic space, college accommodation and infrastructure'* (paragraph 9.1 CD 6.15). Ownership of the land in North West Cambridge is seen by the University as critical to delivering the provision of key worker housing and college accommodation as well as enabling funding of the required infrastructure.
- 8.101 We see merit in the future needs of the University being met in a comprehensively planned urban extension which delivers high quality buildings in a high quality landscaped environment. We accept that in terms of delivery there is considerable benefit to be derived from using land in the single ownership of the University. On the basis of there being a need for the University proposals and that this could not be met elsewhere, we are satisfied that there would be justification for the release of Green Belt land in North West Cambridge to meet that need.

Timing

- 8.102 The Structure Plan identified this location as a reserve to be brought forward 'when required'. We agree that the Green Belt land owned by the University should be husbanded and only brought forward for development when the University can show a clear need for the particular development proposed. Our attention was drawn to the allocation within the Cambridge Local Plan of some 72 hectares of land at West Cambridge for University uses of which 65 hectares are open land.
- 8.103 We note that the University has an ambitious building programme which should see the completion of approximately 9,000 square metres of floorspace by April 2004. However, this represents only about 5% of the total floorspace proposed for the Western Campus. It is unlikely, therefore, that much of the floorspace proposed for the North West area would actually be needed in the short to medium term in order to maintain the growth of the University and its position as a leader in further education and research. The desire to accommodate the wishes of those departments who wish to move out of the centre of the city and any short term need for key worker housing will need to be balanced against the need to safeguard the land to the North West for the longer term needs of the University.

²⁶ University Expansion - North West Cambridge or Alternative Locations? (CD6.15)

These will be matters for the LPAs to consider when they prepare the Local Plan for the Green Belt.

Other matters

- 8.104 There was some criticism of the indicative development proposals produced by the University to show how a mixed use development could be planned for the North West location²⁷. Concern was expressed that, inter alia, water supply, drainage and wildlife issues are not properly addressed. We are satisfied that none of these matters raise a strategic objection to the potential release of Green Belt land in this location for the special needs of the University. It will be for the Local Plan to specify particular development requirements.
- 8.105 As to transportation issues and the relationship of future development to the existing communities, these should be addressed in any detailed masterplan produced for the site and major development in this location would be subject to Transport Assessments. As with the Huntingdon/Histon Road location, such assessments would need to have regard to other developments in the area, including the new settlement, and to the A14 improvements. As we conclude above, this is a matter which can be dealt with in the explanatory text to the policy.

Conclusion

- 8.106 We conclude that the location North West Cambridge which relates to land proposed for university and related uses is suitable for inclusion in Policy P9/3c, but it should only be released from the Green Belt on the basis that the University are able to show a need for the land to be brought forward.

Land North of Barton Road

- 8.107 The proponents of this location submitted to the Panel some fairly detailed information about its suitability. The Panel has had regard to this material insofar as it is appropriate to the strategic level. In our view, there are two main issues relating to this location. These are:
- the impact of major development in this location on Green Belt purposes;
 - the sustainability of the location.

Impact on Green Belt purposes

- 8.108 There is no dispute that the Barton Road location contributes to the setting of Cambridge although the proponents of the scheme argue that other locations proposed for release in the Structure Plan are equally valuable, such as the University land in North West Cambridge.
- 8.109 The land at Barton Road falls within the Coton corridor which brings countryside right in to the heart of the city. Viewed from the west the distinctive skyline of the historic centre is seen against the open foreground of land in the Barton Road area. In our view, the relationship between the historic centre and the countryside in this location is critical to the character of Cambridge. Indeed, the Barton Road area of the city is distinctive in creating a very direct interface between city centre and countryside. We have some

²⁷ North West Development Proposals (CD6.16)

sympathy with the view expressed by South Cambridgeshire, that ‘this is the most important location on the edge of the city’.

- 8.110 This interface would be largely lost by major development in the location proposed. Narrowing the Coton corridor to the extent suggested by the indicative Masterplan for this location would render it almost meaningless as ‘countryside’. Accordingly, we see no reason to disagree with the conclusion of the Buchanan Study that development in this location would conflict with the purpose of preserving the unique character of the city. In our view, this conclusion applies equally to land to the north as to land to the south of Barton Road.

Sustainability

- 8.111 There can be no argument with the fact that the proximity of this location to the city centre renders it potentially highly sustainable in terms of accessibility by slow modes (pedestrians and cyclists). Barton Road is also accessible by such modes to significant areas of employment, notably the University’s western campus. However, unlike other locations proposed for release, Barton Road is not on a major transport corridor and there is no public transport at present. Thus, the development would need to support a public transport system.
- 8.112 The strategy proposed by the proponents of the location is for a high frequency service along Barton Road, Sidgwick Street/Silver Street and Madingley Road – to link the Barton Road location with the University employment areas. We have serious doubts about the deliverability of such a proposal. Major development in this location would be at the ‘end of the line’ for public transport services and would need to deliver high levels of patronage to support a high quality public transport system. We question whether this is a likely proposition.
- 8.113 Whilst we consider that there are sustainability benefits in terms of the location’s proximity to services and facilities in the city centre we do not believe it to be particularly sustainable in terms of the provision of public transport. The need for accessibility is not related solely to the city centre and the University employment areas, but is also relevant to other parts of the city where employment opportunities exist such as Cambridge Northern Fringe, Addenbrooke’s and Cambridge Airport. The rather isolated location of the Barton Road area relative to these locations in public transport terms suggests that major development in this location could encourage car dependency, especially given the proximity to J12 of the M11.
- 8.114 We note the argument which has been put to us that there is a need to develop new housing in the west of the city to balance with the available jobs. Whilst we agree in principle with the desirability of achieving a jobs/housing balance so far as practical, we do not consider this to be the appropriate location in which to provide large-scale housing.

Conclusion

- 8.115 In our view, the potential sustainability benefits of this location do not outweigh the potential harm to Green Belt purposes which would result from major development. This location is the most sensitive of those identified on the western side of the city in terms of its impact on the setting of the historic part of the city. South Cambridgeshire District Council suggested that there may be scope for a modest review of the Green Belt boundary in this sector, but any resulting releases would not be of a strategic scale and, thus, are not relevant to the Structure Plan.

Land North East of Histon

8.116 The Panel were asked to consider the identification of land north east of Histon as a readily deliverable urban extension. We were advised that the location referred to lies about 2km north of the A14/B1049 junction and is in fact in Impington. It is not a strategic location and cannot sensibly be considered to form part of the potential Green Belt releases in the North West Cambridge sector. We are satisfied that any proposals to bring forward land in this location is a matter for the Local Plan.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS ON LOCATIONS

8.117 We conclude that the locations which we recommend the SPAs to include in the Structure Plan, together with the Cambridge Northern Fringe, have the potential to meet the vision of Cambridge as *'a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre'*. These locations have the potential:

- to provide high quality, mixed-use development creating four modern communities on the edge of the city to complement the historic central core; and
- to meet the aims of RPG to provide for the short, medium and long term needs of Cambridge up to and beyond 2016.

In doing so, they will deliver the change in strategy required by RPG to focus development on the city and provide a more sustainable development pattern for the Cambridge Sub-Region

RECOMMENDATION 8C

Redraft Policy P9/3c as follows:

Location

Local Plans will make provision for housing and mixed-use development on land to be released from the Green Belt in accordance with the principles set out in Policy P9/3b and in the following locations as shown on the Key Diagram:

- ***North of Newmarket Road;***
- ***North of Cherry Hinton;***
- ***South and West of Addenbrooke's Hospital;***
- ***East and south-east of Trumpington;***
- ***West of Trumpington Road;***
- ***Cambridge Airport;***
- ***Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road;***
- ***Between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road.***

Purpose

These areas will include locations for the 8,000 dwellings which will be required by 2016. They will help to deliver the vision of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city by:

- *promoting a sustainable and spatially concentrated pattern of locations for development and sustainable travel patterns;*
- *allowing scope for, rather than constraining, continuing development beyond 2016;*

whilst protecting and enhancing the historic character and setting of Cambridge and the important environmental qualities of the surrounding area.

Phasing

With the exception of the following, all of the above sites should be brought forward as early as possible within the Plan period.

- *Cambridge Airport is unlikely to come forward until towards the end of the Plan period but should be treated as a priority for high density development.*
- *Land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road should be reserved for predominantly University-related uses and only brought forward when the University can show a clear need for the land to be released.*

Phasing policies will be set out in Local Plans in accordance with Policy P9/2. Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council will work together on the form and phasing of the Green Belt releases.

Development requirements

Development within any of these locations will be subject to:

- *Sustainability assessments;*
- *Transport assessments;*
- *Securing transport improvements including those identified in Policy P9/10;*
- *Securing provision of other infrastructure as required by Policies P6/1 and P9/9;*
- *Enhancement to landscape, habitat creation and opportunities for recreation within and adjoining development areas.*

Masterplanning

Strategic Masterplans will be prepared for the following locations:

- *The southern fringe of the city as a whole – the Plan should recognise the interdependence of the Addenbrooke's and the east and south east of Trumpington locations. A green corridor should be retained in the vicinity of Hobson's Brook running from the Shelford area into Cambridge north of Long Road. This will be required in association with the south and west of Addenbrooke's and east and south of Trumpington locations²⁸.*
- *The eastern sector including land to the North of Newmarket Road, to the North of Cherry Hinton and Cambridge Airport. Any land release in this location will need to pay proper regard to the need to maintain the penetration of the countryside into the heart of the city provided by the Teversham green finger which links with Coldhams Common.*

These plans should be in place before the commencement of any development in their respective areas and should include provision for early landscaping, recreation access and

²⁸ This may also need to include the West of Trumpington Road location.

biodiversity improvements, including for those areas which may not be programmed for development until after 2016.

Masterplans or Design Frameworks should be prepared for all individual sites to be released from the Green Belt. The Masterplan for West of Trumpington Road will pay particular attention to the need to protect the quality and character of Grantchester Meadows.

Safeguarding land

Any land that is not required for development by 2016 will be designated as safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs.'

Include the following within the supporting text:

'The release for development of the Cambridge Airport location is dependent on the relocation of the Airport and associated facilities. There is a good deal of uncertainty about the precise timescale for this relocation and it is unlikely that the Airport will come forward for development until towards the end of the Plan period but it will provide scope for longer term development beyond 2016.'

'The Transport Assessments required in association with any development in the North West area of Cambridge will need to take into account the likely impact on transportation in the area and on the development proposals, of the CHUMMS proposals to widen the A14, the new settlement proposals and the development proposals in the Cambridge Northern Fringe.'

'The Strategic Masterplans are to be prepared by or for the relevant Local Planning Authority (or jointly where development straddles administrative boundaries) in conjunction with Cambridgeshire County Council. It is expected that local residents groups will be consulted as appropriate. Where Strategic Masterplans are required these should address those issues where there is an interdependency between different sites, such as concerning access, transportation, etc. Where such Masterplans have been prepared it is expected that Design Frameworks will address the detailed issues relating to the individual sites. Elsewhere, Masterplans for strategic locations such as the University land will be expected to address the relationships between the different uses within the overall site and with other existing and proposed developments in the wider locality, including the need for community facilities and services, as well as more detailed design matters. In order to avoid delays in bringing land forward for development to meet the strategy of the Plan it is expected that the masterplanning process will proceed in parallel with the preparation of the relevant Local Plans.'

Add the location West of Trumpington Road to the Key Diagram Cambridge Inset.

CHAPTER 9

NEW SETTLEMENT

- 9.1 Policy P9/4 of the Structure Plan identifies Longstanton/Oakington, to the north west of Cambridge, as the preferred location for a '*sustainable, high quality settlement*'. The policy sets out guidance on its size (ultimately 8-10,000 dwellings), its contribution to housing requirements by 2016 (6,000 dwellings), its role within the Sub-Region and the key infrastructure and other requirements involved in its planning.
- 9.2 The starting point for the identification of the new settlement is Policy 25 of RPG6. This indicates that proposals for a new settlement, with the potential for construction to start by 2006, should be brought forward through the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan and that the plan should define the role of such a settlement within the Sub-Region, its initial size and broad location, and provide guidance on its early implementation. It also indicates that the new settlement should be designed with the potential for further longer term expansion, if needed, and provides guidance on the criteria to be used in its selection, including:
- proximity to Cambridge;
 - location on or facilitating the provision of high quality public transport;
 - the avoidance of national nature and historic environment designations;
 - the avoidance of major groundwater protection areas and floodplain;
 - making maximum use of previously developed land; and
 - the avoidance of loss of high quality agricultural land as far as possible.
- 9.3 The choice of Longstanton/Oakington is the culmination of a long process in examining alternative locations for the new settlement, in the context of developing the overall strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region. This started with the Cambridge Sub-Region Study undertaken by Colin Buchanan and Partners (CD 2.1) and was carried through into an assessment of alternative locations undertaken by the County Council in preparing the Structure Plan.
- 9.4 The case for Longstanton/Oakington, and for a number of competing locations, was also subject to a thorough examination at several sessions during the EIP. The issues raised during these debates can be summarised under the following headings:
- The role of the Structure Plan in identifying the location of the new settlement;
 - The methodology used by the County Council in selecting Longstanton/Oakington;
 - The case for each of the alternative locations put forward: Waterbeach, Wilburton, Cambridge Heath, Great Abington and an expanded Cambourne;
 - The deliverability and timescale for the settlement;
 - The role of the new settlement within the Sub-Region.

We deal with each of these topics below.

ROLE OF THE STRUCTURE PLAN

Criteria-based Approach

- 9.5 It was put to us that the Structure Plan ought not to be so site-specific in identifying Longstanton/Oakington as the preferred location. It was suggested that RPG Policy 25 only refers to the need for the Plan to identify the 'broad location' and it would be preferable to adopt a criteria-based approach and then leave the final selection to the development control process. Options for the Structure Plan might be to identify a preferred transport corridor for the settlement, to limit potential locations to the area north of Cambridge, or to name a shortlist. It was envisaged that a planning application, or competing applications, could be submitted shortly after the Panel Report, short-circuiting the local plan process, with the final decision being made by the Secretary of State following call-in. This would enable the full site-specific details to be tested in a way that is not possible or appropriate at an EIP.
- 9.6 There was little support for this approach from other participants and it is not one which the Panel favours. A similar process was followed in selecting Cambourne as the previous location for a new settlement in Cambridgeshire and this resulted in several years' delay. GO-East confirmed our interpretation that RPG6 intends the Structure Plan to identify with a reasonable degree of precision the location for the new settlement; hence the specification of the key criteria against which the selection should be made. Indeed we note that there was strong pressure from some quarters at the Public Examination into the draft RPG for the RPG itself to identify a preferred site.
- 9.7 There is nothing to be gained, therefore, in putting off this decision to a further stage in the planning process. This would only add to the uncertainty and almost certainly delay the time at which the new settlement can begin to make a contribution to meeting the Sub-Region's housing needs. Moreover, the proposition that a planning application could be made without awaiting the final Structure Plan or the preparation of a Local Plan is the complete antithesis to the plan-led system and not something we could endorse. The Panel are satisfied that we have seen enough documentation and heard sufficient argument during the EIP to be confident in making a firm recommendation about the choice of location. The precise boundaries and site details are, of course, a matter for the Local Plan and a subsequent planning application.

Second New Settlement

- 9.8 A further issue which arose was whether the Structure Plan should include proposals for a second new settlement. The principal reasoning for this was that there was very little to choose between the respective merits of Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach as locations for the settlement and both might ultimately be needed, especially if insufficient capacity in sustainable locations elsewhere was identified. It was pointed out that RPG6 Policy 21 looked to this Structure Plan to allow scope for, rather than constrain, continuing development beyond 2016 and it would therefore be helpful for it to identify a preferred location for a second new settlement, with the potential to come on stream if necessary towards the end of the present Plan period. Other participants argued that two smaller new settlements within this Plan period were preferable, on environmental and other grounds, to one larger development at Longstanton/Oakington.
- 9.9 We note that RPG6 indicates (albeit only in a footnote referring to the sub-regional studies) that any proposals for a second new settlement should relate to the longer term

and be brought forward and considered through the forthcoming RPG for the East of England. On the other hand, our attention was drawn to correspondence between Andrew Lansley MP and DTLR Ministers¹ which stated that it was not the intention of RPG6 to be proscriptive and that the EIP itself was the forum for debate of proposals to determine how best to manage growth in the Cambridge area.

- 9.10 In the same connection it was pointed out that the recently published consultation document on options leading to RPG14 for the East of England² also appears to be looking to the Structure Plan to establish a long-term strategy to 2016 and beyond. The document says *'It is important that the Cambridge Sub-Region should not be disrupted by new or revised proposals in RPG14, so we consider that the current proposals for the area should continue as presently embodied in existing RPG.'* In referring to the implications of the London-Stansted-Cambridge study and linkages with other key centres, the consultation document says that *'These issues should affect the Cambridge Sub-Region only after 2016, and any proposals should be designed to avoid conflict with existing planning of the Sub-Region, and to enable a logical progression of strategy.'*
- 9.11 Although this is only a consultation document and represents the first stage in the development of RPG14, these statements were taken by some participants as a signal that the Structure Plan need not necessarily await further guidance from RPG14 on whether a second new settlement might have a role to play in meeting the long term development needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region. GO-East confirmed that if the Panel wished to recommend a second new settlement, having heard evidence on sustainability, deliverability and other issues, it is within our remit to do so.
- 9.12 We are satisfied on the information before us that within this Structure Plan period a second new settlement is unlikely to be needed. The strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region has identified sufficient capacity, based on RPG6 projections, to cope with housing requirements up to 2016 and for some years beyond. The only circumstances in which a further requirement might arise would be if it emerged that Cambridge Airport was unlikely to become available in the foreseeable future. In these circumstances we are in no doubt that a second new settlement would be the next most sustainable solution for a major development once capacity in other locations identified in the Structure Plan is exhausted. However, since the Airport site is intended only to deliver around 2,500 dwellings before 2016 a decision on this could be deferred until the present Structure Plan (or its successor document) needs up-dating.
- 9.13 Looking to the longer term, as the strategic development areas identified in this Structure Plan are built out, we are convinced that the new settlement option best fits the vision we have set out for the future of the Cambridge Sub-Region in general (Chapter 7) and for a compact Cambridge City in particular (Chapter 8). However, much depends on the scale of continued growth anticipated in the Sub-Region, which is a matter for RPG14. Later in this chapter we examine the case for various competing new settlements and indicate our conclusions on a preferred location, not only for the first new settlement but also a second, should one be needed.

¹ Letters dated 10 December 2001 and 7 January 2002 from Andrew Lansley MP and replies dated 21 December 2001 and 22 January 2002 from Sally Keeble, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, DTLR.

² East of England, Your Region, Your Choice, Your Future, East of England Local Government Conference, September 2002 (CD 4.1.2).

METHODOLOGY IN SELECTION OF THE NEW SETTLEMENT

- 9.14 The Cambridge Sub-Region Study, which reported in September 2001, was carried out in accordance with the guidance set out in RPG6. It identified 15 possible locations for a new settlement and narrowed these down using a range of detailed sustainability criteria to four sites, each of which featured in the testing of spatial development scenarios for the Sub-Region. The four sites were Childerley Gate, Great Abington, Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach.
- 9.15 Cambridgeshire County Council used the findings of the Study to develop a process for assessing the four short-listed locations, together with three other sites brought forward by respondents during consultation on the Structure Plan, namely Wilburton, Cambridge Heath (or Six Mile Bottom) and a new town option based on development east of Cambridge within the Green Belt. By the time of the EIP neither the Childerley Gate nor the east of Cambridge locations were any longer being advanced as serious options for a new settlement, so we have not considered these any further³.
- 9.16 The key features of the County Council's assessment process⁴ included:
- evaluation against 34 criteria (including the RPG6 criteria) under economic, environmental, social, transport, implementation, Green Belt and strategic headings;
 - weighting of the criteria in relation to four factors: fundamental, high importance, medium importance and less critical;
 - assessment of the performance of each location against ratings ranging from A (Good) to E (Poor);
 - a three stage process to narrow down the choice involving: firstly, elimination of sites failing to satisfy the fundamental criteria; secondly, evaluation of remaining locations against criteria of fundamental and high importance; and finally, evaluation of two short-listed locations against all criteria;
 - sensitivity checks at each stage of the process.
- 9.17 Wilburton and Cambridge Heath were eliminated at the first stage of the selection process and Childerley Gate, Great Abington and Cambridge East at the second stage. Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach therefore emerged from the process as the two main contenders for the new settlement. Each site was regarded as having some advantages over the other. However, Longstanton/Oakington was considered to perform more strongly in relation to the most important strategic criteria and had the edge in each of the sensitivity tests undertaken. The factors which the Council considered to be most decisive at the time related to transport (including availability of high quality public transport) and flood risk. In addition, Longstanton/Oakington performed better on deliverability and timescale, largely because of the early availability of the Rapid Transit System and ability to benefit from the A14 improvements.
- 9.18 At the EIP we examined the robustness of the County Council's methodology and subjected each of the locations which were still being advanced as serious contenders for the new settlement to further detailed scrutiny. In addition we examined the case for an

³ Although, in Chapter 8 we consider east of Cambridge under Policy P9/3c – locations for possible release of land in the Green Belt.

⁴ Details are set out in Cambridge Sub-Region: Assessment of New Settlement Locations; Report to Strategic Planning Service Development Group, 27 November 2001. (CD 1.12).

expanded Cambourne as an alternative, or additional, development to Longstanton/Oakington.

Robustness of Methodology

- 9.19 Although the Panel heard a lot of criticism of – as well as a great deal of support for – different aspects of the County Council’s methodology, we could find nothing fundamentally flawed about the overall approach. We reject a suggestion that the criteria chosen and the way they were assessed were somehow ‘bent to fit’ Longstanton/Oakington or Waterbeach. We are satisfied that the methodology was transparent, comprehensive and also inclusive, in that the proponents of the different schemes were invited to give short presentations to the County Council setting out the merits of their proposals.
- 9.20 We do not think that the fact that more information was available about some sites than others fundamentally distorted the conclusions. The assessment was based on the general characteristics of the locations rather than site specific details. The judgements used in assessing performance against the various criteria were fairly broad-based and where quantitative information was employed (for instance relating to previously developed land or proximity to Cambridge) the assessments were clear and fairly incontrovertible. In any event, the Panel itself has been able to assess the relevance of any subsequent additional information provided about specific sites.
- 9.21 It is, of course, possible to alter the scores at the margins by taking a different view on how a particular site performs against another or by shifting the weightings of particular criteria. However, we are satisfied that the County Council’s assessments are fairly robust and that no site has been seriously disadvantaged by the ratings applied. It is also evident from the sensitivity tests undertaken by the County Council that any amount of adjustment is unlikely to affect the overall conclusion that Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach generally outperform the other locations. Moreover, as emphasised by the SPAs, the assessment involved more than a simple number-crunching exercise; the scoring system was simply a systematic tool to underpin a reasoned approach to the process of selecting a preferred site.
- 9.22 In answer to those who argued that the six RPG6 criteria ought all to have been weighted as ‘fundamental’, the Panel invited the SPAs to undertake a further sensitivity test using these criteria alone⁵. Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach still out-performed the other locations by a considerable margin, but, as with some of the other tests, there was very little to choose between these two options.
- 9.23 Further confirmation of the results of the County Council’s methodology comes from a separate exercise undertaken by South Cambridgeshire District Council who undertook their own assessment of the various alternatives for a new settlement location⁶. This pre-dated the consideration of the same matter by the County Council. South Cambridgeshire’s approach was to score those factors where it was considered possible to make an objective judgement. The rankings were relative and, unlike the County Council’s approach, did not attempt to weight the various factors. The analysis supports the proposal to develop a new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington, with Waterbeach as the second favoured option.

⁵ The results are set out in SPA Supplement 25.

⁶ South Cambridgeshire DC: Reports and Minutes of Council Meeting on 18 October 2001 (CD 1.26)

Key Criteria

- 9.24 In the following paragraphs we address some of the specific points raised about key criteria used in the County Council's assessment.
- 9.25 In relation to **proximity to Cambridge** we agree with the principle emphasised by many participants that this should be assessed not only as a function of distance but also by accessibility. This is, in effect, what the County Council have done in including criteria relating to (a) distance and ease of travel by public transport and by road and (b) accessibility to employment. Some concerns were expressed about the precise measures of distance on which the ratings were based but we do not think that too much importance should be attached to relatively minor differences in the travel distance between each site and the centre of Cambridge.
- 9.26 Various views were advanced about which sites offered the best **accessibility to employment**. We think it is reasonable for the assessment to take into account not only the pattern of existing employment but also expected future growth and any likely improved means of access to jobs. On this basis Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach have the best overall access to key employment locations such as the city centre, the Science Park, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Marshalls Aerospace and the University's West Cambridge sites. Great Abington has the best access to high tech jobs at Granta Park, Babraham and Hinxton to the south of Cambridge, as well as good access to Addenbrooke's. Neither Wilburton nor Cambridge Heath are well located for access to employment. In our view all these factors are fairly reflected in the scores for each site.
- 9.27 We agree that the **use of previously developed land** ought to have been weighted as 'fundamental' rather than 'high' since this is a key RPG6 criterion. Only Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach have significant proportions of previously developed land, being former Ministry of Defence airfields. Both were given an 'A' rating in the County Council's assessment, so any re-weighting would not affect the relative scores of these two locations and would only further enhance their superiority over other options.
- 9.28 There was some dispute about the precise measures of previously developed land underpinning the County Council's assessments. The Council explained that these were based on the PPG3 definition (see discussion in Chapter 5) and took into account both the total amount of previously developed land within the curtilage of each site and the actual area of buildings and hardstandings. These had been carefully measured from air photographs and were regarded as fairly accurate. Although a number of other estimates were referred to, we have no reason to suppose that the County Council's figures are seriously wrong.
- 9.29 Nor do we think that the assessment ought to have allowed for the actual amount of brownfield land likely to be built on at Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach and thus the relative contribution of the sites towards the brownfield targets in Policy P5/2 of the Plan. This would pre-suppose a knowledge about the final layout and land uses across each site about which there can be no certainty at the present time and which in any event is inappropriate in a strategic assessment. Although important, we do not believe that the contribution towards meeting brownfield targets should be an overriding factor in deciding which location is the most sustainable.
- 9.30 In relation to the ability of each location **to facilitate the provision of high quality public transport**, Longstanton is rated 'A', Waterbeach 'B' and the other locations 'C' or

‘D’. Although we heard objections that the opportunities for the provision of high quality public transport at the other locations had been underplayed, it seems to us that the scoring fairly reflects the relative positions of each option.

- 9.31 The key difference is that the Rapid Transit System serving Longstanton/Oakington is already accepted by Government and programmed as part of the CHUMMS improvements. Whilst some questions were raised about the costs, capacity and effectiveness of the system (see Chapter 6), we agree with the SPAs that there is a greater degree of certainty that it will be delivered. There is also considerable synergy between the Rapid Transit System and the new settlement, in that the latter can provide additional patronage to make the system more viable and lead to an improvement in services, as well as provide the opportunity for developer contributions towards the Rapid Transit System. It seems unlikely from what we heard at the EIP that there is any serious risk of the strategic role of the Rapid Transit System in relieving congestion on the A14 being compromised by the additional pressures of people travelling to and from the new settlement.
- 9.32 Turning to the location of each proposal in relation to **flood risk**, we agree with those who argued that it is misleading and inaccurate to score Longstanton/Oakington as ‘A’ when parts of the area lie within the Environment Agency’s flood risk area and there has been a history of flooding at Oakington. By contrast other areas with no flood risk such as Great Abington and Cambridge Heath score the same, whilst Waterbeach scores ‘B’.
- 9.33 The issue of flood risk and drainage was, understandably, one which greatly concerned local residents, especially in the village of Oakington. At the EIP we heard confirmation from the Environment Agency that as far as they are concerned there are no substantive differences on flood risk between Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach. Both have small areas of land which could be at risk of flood but on the basis of the further work undertaken by the promoters of the two schemes, it is possible to avoid development on those parts of the sites. As for the risk that development of either site could generate or exacerbate flooding elsewhere through surface water drainage, the Environment Agency accepted that technical solutions involving balancing lakes and ‘green’ drainage systems would suffice to mitigate such risk. Associated measures might also go a long way towards reducing the existing flood risk in nearby locations such as Oakington village.
- 9.34 The SPAs accepted that on the basis of the Environment Agency’s more recent assessment both Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach should score the same. This would bring these two locations even more closely together on the overall assessment. However, any readjustment of the score for these two locations vis-à-vis the other options would only have a marginal effect on the overall performance of each of the sites.
- 9.35 One or two participants suggested that the **deliverability** of each location ought to have figured more prominently in the County Council’s assessment. Key to this is the ability of the new settlement to meet the RPG6 requirement that construction should be able to start by 2006.
- 9.36 We deal in more detail with specific aspects of the deliverability of Longstanton/Oakington and the other locations later in this chapter. So far as the scoring system is concerned, the presence of four criteria under the heading of ‘implementation’ is, in our view, sufficient to give this aspect an appropriate degree of weight. Two of these criteria relate to any improvements needed to roads and public transport which are not already planned, a third to the likely costs of such improvements and a fourth to the relative complexity of each site for development. Although land ownership and control

and developer readiness are obviously important when it comes to a final decision, we do not think that it would have been appropriate explicitly to have included such factors in a broad strategic assessment of the different locations.

- 9.37 To summarise, we do not consider that the way that these specific criteria have been handled in the assessment process has fundamentally biased the overall conclusions which the County Council have drawn from the exercise. If anything, the review which the Panel has been able to undertake during the EIP has tended to confirm that Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach have similar merits as locations for the new settlement, which set them aside from the other locations examined. We go on to consider the merits of the different locations in the sections which follow.

ALTERNATIVE NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS

Waterbeach

- 9.38 Most of the Waterbeach site comprises a former airfield still operating as a Ministry of Defence site. It lies 11.5 kms north of Cambridge on the A10, close to the Cambridge Research Park at Landbeach. Its proximity to the Cambridge - Ely railway line provides opportunities for public transport by rail, as well as by bus along the A10.
- 9.39 As indicated above, on the basis of the strategic assessment process there is not a lot to choose between Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach as locations for the new settlement. The County Council accepted that in many respects Waterbeach might do as good a job as Longstanton/Oakington in meeting the RPG6 and other criteria. Its major advantages include: its proximity to Cambridge; the use of previously developed land (potentially more in terms of actual buildings and hard standings than at Longstanton/Oakington); the opportunities for providing a choice of means of high quality public transport by both road and rail; accessibility to employment (including the option of walking or cycling to the nearby Cambridge Research Park); the possibility of developing a Park and Ride facility serving the A10 corridor; the greater scope for long term expansion (up to 15,000 dwellings); and its potential strategic role as a 'stepping stone' for economic development to the north east.
- 9.40 One of the key factors which counted against Waterbeach in the County Council's original assessment, namely flood risk, now needs to be revised in the light of the Environment Agency's advice that there is little to choose between Waterbeach and Longstanton/Oakington, based on the further work undertaken on mitigation factors. Nor do we attach great weight to arguments that a development associated with improvements in rail access would tend to increase long distance commuting to London. Insofar as this is true, commuting by rail is a good deal more sustainable than commuting by car. The latter is more likely to be the case in other proposed locations which are closer to the major strategic road network.
- 9.41 The major doubt about Waterbeach concerns the deliverability of the public transport improvements within the timescale required. The promoters of the scheme laid great stress on the advantages of a rail shuttle from the site into Cambridge station and on to Addenbrooke's Hospital. This, together with a proposed high quality public transport system by bus along the A10, was claimed to provide superior opportunities to Longstanton/Oakington in terms of choice, reliability, comfort, capacity and speed.

- 9.42 A great deal of work has been undertaken by the promoters to demonstrate that a rail shuttle from Waterbeach to Addenbrooke's is both technically and financially feasible. The proposals include dedicated station and line capacity at Waterbeach, an additional platform at Cambridge Station (planned as part of the West Anglia Route Modernisation Enhancement (WARM-E) proposals) and an additional rail track to Addenbrooke's.
- 9.43 However, at the EIP the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) made it clear that in the light of a national review of rail investment priorities it was difficult to give any assurances that a scheme dependent on these rail improvements could go ahead in the foreseeable future.⁷ Key difficulties include:
- the need to give priority in managing existing and future capacity to meeting national rail requirements, which means that at the moment the SRA is unable to guarantee the train paths required for the effective operation of the proposed shuttle service;
 - the fact that the WARM-E project is neither committed nor funded for implementation means that the SRA cannot guarantee to provide the enhanced infrastructure at Cambridge Station;
 - doubts about whether the proposed additional rail track to Addenbrooke's would be sufficient to overcome long term track capacity issues means that land proposed for the dedicated rail shuttle might be needed by the SRA for track enhancements to the main line.
- 9.44 Whilst the promoters of the Waterbeach scheme suggested that a more limited rail shuttle with reduced frequency might still be operable between the site and Cambridge station, it is clear that a significant plank underpinning the Waterbeach proposal is in doubt, at least until the SRA's national rail investment priorities are clarified. It would therefore be far too risky, in our view, to base a major element of the development strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region on the delivery of a new settlement at Waterbeach which relied on this key infrastructure being in place in time to enable construction to start by 2006.
- 9.45 We have considered whether Waterbeach might still be a viable proposition based initially on a high quality bus system along the A10. The County Council expressed some scepticism about the technical feasibility and adequacy of what was being proposed, namely bus lanes along the A10 and bus priority measures at the A10/A14 Milton interchange, accompanied by various highway safety and capacity improvements. Concerns were expressed as to whether there was enough space along the A10 for bus lanes, the impact of additional traffic on the A14 and the adequacy of the junction improvements. The debate on this was somewhat inconclusive, partly because it appeared that the most recent work undertaken by the promoters had not yet been fully evaluated either by the County Council or (insofar as the proposals affect the A14) by the Highways Agency. Nevertheless, there are sufficient doubts about the practicality of the proposals at this stage to reinforce our caution about recommending Waterbeach as a viable alternative to Longstanton/Oakington for the new settlement.
- 9.46 However, were the transport obstacles capable of being overcome at some point in the future and particularly if the rail shuttle could be implemented, we are satisfied that Waterbeach would be a good location for a development contributing to the longer term growth of the Sub-Region. As indicated in paragraphs 9.12-13, the timing of a second new settlement would depend upon the rate of progress at the other strategic locations

⁷ Details are set out in the SRA's written submission to the EIP and in a letter to Symonds Group Transport Consultancy, consultants to the promoters of the Waterbeach new settlement proposal, dated 15 November 2002.

identified in the Structure Plan and the scale of longer term growth in the Cambridge area identified in the forthcoming RPG14.

Wilburton

- 9.47 Wilburton also lies on the A10, 17 kms to the north east of Cambridge City and around 7 kms south of Ely. Of the locations tested by the County Council, it is the most distant of all the new settlement locations from the centre of Cambridge.
- 9.48 Overall, Wilburton performed poorly in comparison to most other locations in the evaluations undertaken by both the Buchanan Report and the County Council. It was discounted at the first stage of the selection process by the County Council, having scored badly on: distance from Cambridge; accessibility to jobs; the need for significant road improvements in order to cater for traffic and deliver high quality public transport; contribution to meeting the housing needs of Cambridge and the Sub-Region; and flood risk and landscape factors. The Wilburton site involves no previously developed land and includes more high quality agricultural land than either Longstanton/Oakington or Waterbeach.
- 9.49 The main argument in its favour advanced by the promoters of the scheme is that, unlike Longstanton/Oakington, it is a new settlement site where house building could be assured to start by 2006, in line with RPG6 requirements. This is based on arguments concerning the status of land ownership and developer control over the site, the ability to submit an early planning application and obtain early permission and the absence of any infrastructure constraints reliant on external funding or requiring Transport and Works Act procedures.
- 9.50 The Panel does not accept these arguments. In our view Wilburton is no better placed than any other proposal to obtain early planning permission and it is clear that any land ownership or site control issues at Longstanton/Oakington are either resolved or capable of being resolved in good time for a start on site. As for infrastructure constraints, whilst Longstanton/Oakington is reliant on delivery of the Rapid Transit System and the other CHUMMS proposals, Wilburton itself could not proceed satisfactorily without significant improvements to the A10.
- 9.51 There were differences of view between the promoters and the County Council as to the standard of improvements likely to be required to the A10 and the capability of these being delivered. The promoters base their scheme on a widening of the A10 between Cambridge Research Park and Milton Interchange to wide, single carriageway standard, accompanied by a high quality public transport system including a dedicated bus route bypassing the A10/A14 interchange at Milton, a park and ride site at Wilburton and various other local improvements. The County Council indicated that they had been unable to agree a number of the assumptions underpinning the transport assessment undertaken by the promoters, including the modal split, trip rates and park and ride proposals. Many of the transport problems affecting the Waterbeach proposal, including the impact of extra traffic on the A10, congestion at the A10/A14 Milton Interchange and width capacity for dedicated bus lanes, also apply to the Wilburton scheme.
- 9.52 Although the promoters said that the A10 route had been carefully appraised and they were confident that their proposals were viable, there is sufficient uncertainty to cast serious doubt on the claims that the Wilburton scheme can be delivered much more easily than Longstanton/Oakington. Moreover, even if the arguments about ease of

deliverability had greater substance, the Panel does not accept that this consideration should outweigh all others.

- 9.53 The overwhelming disadvantage of Wilburton, in our view, is its relative remoteness from Cambridge compared with other locations and its poor performance against the RPG6 requirement of promoting a better balance between housing and employment close to Cambridge. Added to this are some doubts expressed by the Environment Agency about the possible effects on land drainage of proposals to raise the land level on parts of the site in order to mitigate flood risk.
- 9.54 For these reasons we do not regard Wilburton as a serious contender for the new settlement. We note that this location has twice been rejected as a new settlement site under the previous ‘dispersal’ strategy for Cambridgeshire. We think it is even less suitable as part of the new strategy seeking to concentrate development closer to Cambridge.

Great Abington

- 9.55 Great Abington lies 14.5 kms south of Cambridge, adjoining the A11 and just to the south of the A1307 route into the city. The high tech employment complex of Granta Park is adjacent to the site on the north. Much of the site at Great Abington is a pre-war ‘Land Settlement’ area comprising a large number of smallholdings with homes.
- 9.56 In the County Council’s selection process Great Abington performed better than either Wilburton or Cambridge Heath but was discounted at the second stage of assessment on the basis of its performance against a number of key criteria. These included: its location in relation to meeting the housing needs of Cambridge and the Sub-Region and the likelihood that residents might be more likely to commute towards London and Stansted; its relatively poor accessibility into Cambridge; its location over a groundwater protection zone (GPZ); uncertainties over drainage; and difficulty in accommodating traffic movements.
- 9.57 Great Abington does, however, have a number of factors in its favour. It has the best accessibility to the growing high tech clusters on the south side of Cambridge, notably at Granta Park, Babraham and Hinxton, and good accessibility to Addenbrooke’s. The opportunity to provide high quality public transport along the A1307 would improve access towards Cambridge and to the Babraham Park and Ride site. It also has excellent access to the strategic road network via the A11 and A505 and offers a variety of access routes into and around Cambridge. It contains some previously developed land, albeit less than at either Longstanton/Oakington or Waterbeach, and it scored well on the County Council’s landscape suitability assessment. There is no flood risk and the Environment Agency anticipated no particular problems in providing solutions to surface water run off from the site. The groundwater protection zone would constitute a constraint affecting part of the site unless the borehole were moved but our understanding is that development could be designed so as to avoid the GPZ and that the solutions needed to address on-site drainage might help to alleviate existing problems with septic tanks draining into the underlying chalk.
- 9.58 However, these advantages are out-weighed by the disadvantages of this location. We agree with the County Council that it is not so well placed as the other sites to meet the housing needs of Cambridge. Its location on the southern side of the Sub-Region, with

good access to the M11, would provide a greater potential for attracting residents with jobs further south towards Stansted and London.

- 9.59 It is also apparent from the discussion at the EIP that less work has been done on developing the transport proposals for Great Abington compared with the other locations. No detailed transport assessment has been undertaken and both the County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council felt that the scheme lacked credibility in terms of: the lack of a 'critical mass' to support high quality public transport; the proposed road and junction improvements; and the absence of any proposals for accessing major employment locations to the north of Cambridge. Overall, we agree that there is a greater likelihood that Great Abington would develop as a car-based new settlement than either Longstanton/Oakington or Waterbeach.
- 9.60 In addition, the whole of the Great Abington site is classed as agricultural land in BMV Class 1. Although the promoters argued that most of the Land Settlement plots are no longer in agricultural use, this does not detract from the intrinsic quality of the land, whilst the area to the east and south of the Land Settlement site is still actively farmed. We were also left with some doubts in our minds about deliverability, arising from the multiplicity of ownerships on the Land Settlement site and the extent to which this might complicate land assembly and affect either the capacity to deliver housing by 2006 or the optimum design and layout of the new settlement.
- 9.61 Overall, we are not convinced that a new settlement at Great Abington is a viable alternative to Longstanton/Oakington and we would regard this location as less satisfactory than Waterbeach for a second new settlement if one is required in the longer term.

Cambridge Heath

- 9.62 Cambridge Heath, also known as Six Mile Bottom, is situated 16.2kms to the east of Cambridge, roughly equidistant between Cambridge and Newmarket.
- 9.63 Cambridge Heath was initially included on the 'long list' of possible locations for the new settlement in the Buchanan Report. However, following the initial assessment it fell into the 'lower priority' category and was not therefore included in the 'short list' comparison made in the Report. Notwithstanding this, the promoters sought to promote the Cambridge Heath location through the Structure Plan and hence it was included in the assessment of seven locations considered by the County Council. Despite the proposer's assertions to the contrary, we are satisfied that the proposals for Cambridge Heath were evaluated on a level playing field with the other new settlement proposals.
- 9.64 In the County Council's assessment Cambridge Heath was discounted at the first stage of selection. Its principle weaknesses were: distance from Cambridge; no brownfield land; doubts about the viability of high quality public transport; location in relation to meeting the Sub-Region's housing needs; the likelihood of unsustainable road-based out-commuting; and concerns about landscape suitability and the presence of a groundwater protection zone.
- 9.65 There are one or two positive factors in favour of this location. It is not affected by any flood risk. There is an existing railway line that passes through the site, with opportunities for a new station and a fast rail service into Cambridge. There is potential for longer term expansion beyond 10,000 dwellings. At the EIP, the promoters presented evidence to show that concerns over landscape quality, the ground water protection zone and any

adverse impact on the racing industry, could be overcome through careful design and engineering solutions. We were also assured that the development will enable the protection of the historic designations on the site and that there are no land ownership or other constraints affecting deliverability.

- 9.66 Nevertheless, there are a number of serious concerns about the suitability of the Cambridge Heath location. Even with an additional station on the railway line, there are considerable uncertainties over whether both the track capacity and the capacity at Cambridge station are capable of running a service which is sufficiently frequent to constitute a HQPT. Moreover, Cambridge railway station, which is proposed as the city terminus, is some distance from the majority of employment locations, services and facilities in the city centre. It may not be as attractive an alternative as private vehicle use for those with destinations in the city or the employment sites to the north.
- 9.67 The proposers indicated that in the longer term it was their intention to introduce a Light Rapid Transit (LRT) system between Newmarket and Drummer Street Bus Station in Cambridge city centre, to serve the new settlement. Whilst such a scheme, running at a regular frequency, would clearly meet the requirement for HQPT, the feasibility of this has only been considered at a very preliminary level. No detailed engineering and other studies have been undertaken and there is a high level of uncertainty regarding the viability of the LRT proposals.
- 9.68 This is confirmed by evidence from the Strategic Rail Authority⁸, which makes it clear that substantial further infrastructure would be required to facilitate shared running by light and heavy rail on the existing track. It also states that *'the SRA is unable to fund this project through public subsidy. The SRA has prioritised its investment plans in its Strategic Plan. If this scheme were to go ahead, the entire costs of heavy rail infrastructure or signalling and any operational costs associated with the project would need to be underwritten by the light rail promoters'*. Given the significant costs associated with the scheme, including proposals for tunnelling or road running under or through Cambridge city centre, there are serious question marks over the feasibility and deliverability of such a system.
- 9.69 Turning to the location of Cambridge Heath in relation to highways, the proposers claim that this location has an advantage over other proposed options due to its close proximity to the A11 and A14, and thus to the motorway network beyond. Whilst this is not disputed, it does represent something of a double-edged sword. There are obvious strategic benefits in having quick and easy access onto the national road network but there is a danger that this will simply encourage greater use of private cars as opposed to public transport. It is also more likely to attract residents with jobs outside the Cambridge area and undermine one of the key purposes of the new settlement.
- 9.70 Our concerns over the provision of HQPT and the contribution of this location to meeting the housing needs of the Sub-Region, combined with the fact that the vast majority of the land proposed for development is greenfield and of high agricultural quality, convinces us that Cambridge Heath would not represent a sustainable place for the new settlement. The benefits of this location are insufficient to outweigh its fundamental weaknesses and we do not, therefore, believe that Cambridge Heath is a viable alternative to Longstanton/Oakington.

⁸ Written representation to the EIP, dated 20 November 2002.

Cambourne

- 9.71 Cambourne is an existing new settlement established in the 1980's under previous Structure Plan provisions, with an intended capacity of around 3,300 dwellings. It is located on the A428 some 14.7 kms west of Cambridge. Around 700 dwellings have already been constructed and the development of a business park and shopping centre started.
- 9.72 Cambourne was not among the new settlement locations considered by the SPAs in their selection process but was included in the long list of potential locations assessed by the Buchanan Study. At that time, it was included in the 'lower priority' category of sites, as against the options listed as 'higher priority' (Longstanton/Oakington, Waterbeach, Great Abington and Childerley Gate), principally because of dwelling capacity constraints. However, the Study recognised that Cambourne had some claim to be considered as a 'higher priority' site in view of its decisive strength in terms of being relatively close to Cambridge, landscape and environmental suitability, good access to park and ride facilities and relative ease of development. It was left in the 'lower priority' category because of perceived design and sustainability problems inherent in expanding from its present envelope to the 6,000-10,000 dwelling range required by a new settlement.
- 9.73 At the EIP it emerged that the expansion of Cambourne was being promoted not so much as a straightforward alternative to Longstanton/Oakington as a complementary development capable of contributing more effectively to the housing requirements of the Cambridge Sub-Region in the medium term. This was based on the premise that it was unlikely that the new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington will be capable of delivering 6,000 dwellings by 2016 due to the lengthy planning processes involved, potential delays in completion of transport improvements and unrealistic build rates. It was suggested that Cambourne might also be a more reliable alternative to some of the other strategic development sites involving Green Belt releases to the east of Cambridge.
- 9.74 A number of propositions for the expansion of Cambourne were included in the documentation put to us. These included the intensification of the existing Masterplan proposals by increasing the density of development (already the subject of a planning application) which would involve an increase from the design size of 3,300 up to 5,000 dwellings. In addition, there were three proposals for physical expansion of the site: to the east on to the disused Bourn Airfield, to the west of the present development, and to the north of the A428. We have not regarded it as part of our remit to examine the respective merits of these proposals but rather to consider the general principle of an expansion of Cambourne as part of strategic development for the Sub-Region. We note, however, that development on Bourn Airfield is an option that has already been subject to previous testing at public inquiry (in 1992) and was found to be a suitable development site in principle by the Secretary of State.
- 9.75 Although Cambourne did not figure in the SPAs' selection process it does appear to have a number of strengths when assessed against the same criteria. It is only a little further from the centre of Cambridge than either Longstanton/ Oakington or Waterbeach and has reasonably good access via the A428/Madingley Road. It is close to the expanding University sites in west Cambridge and has good access to other employment locations north of Cambridge via the A14. The dualling of the A428 from Caxton Common to Hardwick, due to be completed by 2006, will improve the approach into Cambridge and provide an opportunity to introduce a high quality public transport system along the old A428 alignment. There is no flood risk and further technical investigation undertaken by the promoters indicates that previous concerns identified by the Buchanan Study about

foul water drainage and surface water drainage are not serious and can easily be resolved. There are no environmental or other designations affecting the site, nor any Grade 1 agricultural land. Development on Bourn Airfield would involve some use of previously developed land.

- 9.76 The SPAs and South Cambridgeshire District Council were, however, strongly opposed to any significant enlargement of the Cambourne site, although it was recognised that a modest re-assessment of capacity within the existing Masterplan envelope might be acceptable. The principal concerns were that a major expansion introduced at this stage of Cambourne's growth would be disruptive to the carefully planned evolution of the community, its environment and facilities and would break assurances given to incoming residents and those in nearby villages that Cambourne would not expand further.
- 9.77 Whilst the Panel understands these arguments it is clear from all that we heard at the EIP that there is a general recognition that Cambourne as conceived at present does not represent a particularly sustainable community. The densities on which it is designed (around 15-20 dwellings per hectare) do not meet PPG3 requirements and although the settlement will provide a range of facilities, its size is insufficient to support the full range and quality of services required by the resident population, notably a secondary school and a wider range of employment opportunities. The proposed relocation of the South Cambridgeshire Council offices to the business park suggests that Cambourne could be set to become the administrative heart of the District. It was suggested that instead of being a modest new village expansion Cambourne could aspire to become a small sustainable Market Town with a wider range of services, jobs and facilities.
- 9.78 We can see the force in these arguments. The planning environment in which Cambourne was originally conceived has changed and it would be wrong to leave the settlement as it is if a more sustainable community can be achieved. Expansion might provide not only a wider range of facilities for residents but also the critical mass to support a high quality public transport system to Cambridge, achieved through developer contributions via a re-negotiated Section 106 agreement.
- 9.79 A key question is whether further development at Cambourne is needed in order to meet the housing and related requirements of the Sub-Region. In terms of the sequential approach to the choice of locations it comes lower in the priority list than development in and around Cambridge itself, including the Green Belt release sites on the edge of the city. We are also satisfied that it is not an alternative to the new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington. In our proposed changes to the housing allocations in Policy P9/2 (see Chapter 7) Cambourne would count as a previously established new settlement alongside Market Towns and rural centres. This provides South Cambridgeshire District Council with the opportunity to review the scale of growth at Cambourne in the context of the overall allocation to the District under this heading. It seems at least possible that expansion at Cambourne may be more sustainable than some of the existing commitments in villages elsewhere in South Cambridgeshire.
- 9.80 In addition, there may be scope for Cambourne to provide both flexibility in the event of any shortfall in the delivery of housing later in the Plan period at other strategic sites, including the new settlement, and an opportunity for contributing to the continued growth of the Sub-Region in the longer term, alongside the possibility of a second new settlement. The precise scale and phasing of development will be a matter for South Cambridgeshire District Council to determine in the context of preparing the next Local Plan or Local Development Framework. This should be done in consultation with partner LPAs and other stakeholders.

Overall Conclusions on New Settlement

- 9.81 To summarise the Panel's conclusions on the location for the new settlement, we are satisfied that the SPAs have made the optimum choice in Longstanton/Oakington. Together with Waterbeach it is clearly superior to the other locations when measured against the key RPG6 criteria and the additional criteria taken into account by the County Council. The detailed appraisal we were able to undertake of the competing proposals has served, if anything, to reinforce this position. In comparison with Waterbeach, Longstanton/Oakington has the distinct advantage of benefitting from the CHUMMS transport proposals whereas Waterbeach suffers from doubts raised by the Strategic Rail Authority concerning deliverability of the proposed rail shuttle, as well as some uncertainty about the feasibility and effectiveness of the other transport improvements.
- 9.82 However, should a second new settlement be required to meet the development requirements of the Cambridge Sub-Region, either towards the end of the Plan period or, more likely, beyond 2016, we would regard Waterbeach as the most sustainable of the locations we have examined at the EIP.
- 9.83 We also conclude that there is a strong case for re-examining the scale of growth planned at Cambourne, since it appears that an increase in capacity would be likely to result in a more sustainable community, as well as providing greater flexibility in contributing to the housing and other needs of the Sub-Region, either within this Plan period or the next.
- 9.84 In the following sections of this chapter we conclude by looking in more detail at some of the key issues raised during the debate about the deliverability and timescale for the new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington and its wider role in the Sub-Region.

DELIVERABILITY AND TIMESCALE OF THE NEW SETTLEMENT

- 9.85 A key question is whether it is realistic to expect a new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington to meet the RPG6 requirement of starting construction by 2006⁹ and whether it could deliver 6,000 dwellings by 2016. A number of difficulties were anticipated in achieving these targets:

- delays in the planning processes before development could start;
- constraints on land disposal;
- the timing of provision of the requisite infrastructure;
- the realism of meeting the build rates required.

We deal with each of these issues below.

Planning processes

- 9.86 We do not accept the suggestion of some participants that taking the new settlement through the normal planning processes will so delay matters that it is unlikely that a start on site can be made by 2006. The promoters of Longstanton/Oakington indicated that

⁹ In an exchange of correspondence before the EIP GO-East clarified that the RPG6 requirement should be interpreted as meaning that there should be a reasonable likelihood that a planning permission for the identified location could be implemented during 2006. There should also be an undertaking that the infrastructure required to support the settlement will be provided (letter from Go-East dated 18 September 2002).

they were working on the assumption that the Structure Plan will be adopted by late Summer/Autumn of 2003 and that the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Review (which is being prepared in parallel) will proceed to Public Inquiry by mid-2004. A planning application will be submitted during the Inquiry so that the planning authority could issue planning permission as soon as the Local Plan is adopted in 2005. In parallel with the statutory planning processes the developers and LPA will be working on the Masterplan and other details to ensure an immediate start on the site.

- 9.87 Although this timetable is tight we see no reason why, with co-operation and goodwill on all sides, it should not be achieved. As indicated in Chapter 5, assuming the new Local Development Framework processes are in place the greater flexibility these afford could help to 'fast-track' important planning proposals such as the new settlement.

Constraints on land disposal

- 9.88 It was also suggested by some participants that delays could be incurred arising from statutory constraints on land disposal by the Ministry of Defence (MOD). Defence Estates were able to provide categoric reassurances that there would be no difficulty in making MoD land available at Longstanton/Oakington.¹⁰ 'Crichel Down' rules, which govern the disposal of property acquired compulsorily or under threat of compulsion, are unlikely to apply and a sale by private treaty to the developers would satisfy the Treasury rules of disposal which apply in special circumstances like Longstanton/Oakington. A letter from the Home Secretary to the Secretary of State for Defence also confirmed that the present temporary use of part of the Oakington site for housing asylum seekers would not hinder the progress of the new settlement.
- 9.89 A joint statement by Defence Estates and the developers of the Longstanton/Oakington new settlement further confirmed the intention of the two parties to work together to ensure sufficient and timely progress to enable construction to commence in 2006. The developers already own the land required for highway infrastructure improvements between the new settlement and the A14. In the light of these facts it does not appear that land ownership should act as a constraint on delivering the new settlement.

Provision of infrastructure

- 9.90 A fundamental concern about deliverability is the relationship between the provision of key transport infrastructure and the development of the new settlement. The principal infrastructure required is the Rapid Transit System, improvements to the A14 and other local road improvements, and provision for sustainable modes such as walking and cycling. It was consistently pointed out to us that any hold up in the provision of the Rapid Transit System or the CHUMMS A14 improvements could put back a start on house building and thus undermine the whole Strategy. This was regarded as the real 'Achilles Heel' of the Longstanton/Oakington proposal and a good reason for looking for either an alternative location not so reliant on external funding or a strategic fall-back position, should the fears about delivery of the infrastructure be realised.
- 9.91 As we have already indicated in Chapters 3 and 6, the CHUMMS Strategy received Ministerial approval in December 2001 and a joint statement to the EIP by Cambridgeshire County Council, GO-East and the Highways Agency indicates that work has been progressing on the major elements of the Plan. A supplementary statement by

¹⁰ Supplementary Statement on the Deliverability and Timing of the New Settlement (Defence Estates, 31 October 2002).

the County Council to the EIP sets out the indicative phasing and delivery of transport infrastructure in relation to the new settlement (SPA Supplement 2).

- 9.92 The intention is that the Rapid Transit System will be in place by late 2006/early 2007, in time for the first occupancy of houses in the new settlement. An initial bid for the Rapid Transit System was included with Cambridgeshire County Council's Local Transport Plan Annual Progress Report in 2002. The Government's response indicates that, subject to the completion of any additional work which may be necessary prior to the next round of Annual Progress Reports, it would be willing to consider the case for the scheme before the next settlement.¹¹ The prospects for early confirmation of public funding support for the Rapid Transit System therefore look promising. Other possible funding options include private sector contributions from the developers of the new settlement, a Private Finance Initiative scheme and developer contributions through the Section 106 'pooling' arrangements.
- 9.93 In parallel with exploring funding options, the SuperCam Consortium and the County Council have been working towards the submission during 2003 of the necessary Transport and Works Act Orders. Although some participants suggested that confirmation of these Orders alone could take three years and therefore delay approval of the Rapid Transit System, we are satisfied on the evidence of progress with recent Orders that the County Council's target of a Public Inquiry in late 2003/early 2004 and approval in early 2005 should be achievable.
- 9.94 In short, although there can obviously be no absolute certainty about the delivery of the Rapid Transit System, we are satisfied that good progress is being made on all the funding, technical and administrative procedures necessary to ensure that the scheme is operational by late 2006/early 2007.
- 9.95 Turning to the A14 improvements, the Highways Agency indicated at the EIP that these would be completed by 2011 at the earliest. Many participants, including representatives of the existing villages of Longstanton, Oakington and around, expressed serious concern about the impact of additional traffic on the A14 and the minor roads in the vicinity and questioned whether the new settlement could go ahead until all these issues were resolved.
- 9.96 The A14 improvements include not only a widening of the road from dual 2 to dual 3 lane standard between Bar Hill and Fenstanton and a new off-line route west of Fenstanton, but also the construction of parallel local roads to the A14 from Fenstanton to Girton and junction rationalisation on the A14 to relieve it of local traffic. Internal and link roads for the new settlement to provide a connection to the A14 and to the parallel local roads at Bar Hill will be delivered by the developer on land in their ownership or control and so will be able to accompany or precede development of the new settlement. No timescale has been set for delivery of the A14 parallel roads but the SPAs suggested that these could be phased at an earlier stage to the main works in order to facilitate development of the new settlement. We understand that the parallel roads will be the responsibility of the County Council and a major scheme bid will be submitted as part of the 2003 Local Transport Programme.
- 9.97 Although the timetable prepared by the SPAs indicates that not all of the necessary transport infrastructure will be in place prior to commencement of the new settlement, all

¹¹ Letter from GO-East to Cambridgeshire County Council with details of the 2003/4 Local Transport Capital Expenditure Settlement, dated 10 December 2002.

is programmed to be complete at or before the mid point in its development. Clearly, there can be no absolute certainty that the A14 improvements will be delivered fully in accordance with this timetable. However, the Panel has no reason to believe that the management and phasing of infrastructure works cannot be undertaken at a rate which enables the new settlement to commence on time and to be built out in line with the anticipated programme. The essential key to this is the Rapid Transit System, which will need to be in place from the occupation of the first dwellings in order to influence the modal split and minimise the impact of car movements on the road network.

House building rate

- 9.98 Even if issues connected with the planning processes, land disposal and infrastructure provision can be resolved, it was suggested that the build rates needed in order to achieve 6,000 dwellings by 2016 are highly optimistic and probably unachievable. A great deal of somewhat conflicting evidence was presented to us drawn from developments elsewhere, including the local examples of Cambourne and Hampton (Peterborough), to support the contention that a sustained peak build rate of between 300 and 450 units, after a gradual build up, was the maximum likely to be achievable. The developers of Longstanton/Oakington brought forward their own figures, based on examples in the Thames Valley and elsewhere, to show that much higher rates could be achieved. At Hampton (for which the same developers are now responsible) we were told that there are 11 builders on site producing around 500 units in 2002, in a housing market much weaker than Cambridge.
- 9.99 Based on a similar development approach as at Hampton, the developers anticipate achieving 200 private sector completions at Longstanton/Oakington in the first year and then accelerating quickly to 510 units per annum. The development programme anticipates affordable housing providing a further 153 units per annum. Slightly different figures were provided by the SPAs showing a slower acceleration but a significantly higher peak building rate. Both would produce a total of 6,000 dwellings by 2016.
- 9.100 The Panel regards either of these programmes as ambitious, though it is clear that they are not totally unprecedented. In a strong housing market like Cambridge there is no reason in principle why there should be a problem with sales of private sector housing. However, it was suggested that practical experience elsewhere shows that achieving the kind of high quality development demanded by Policies P1/3 and P9/4 of the Structure Plan inevitably impacts on the quantity of housing delivered; also that managing and co-ordinating more than 5 or 6 housebuilders on one site whilst maintaining a cohesive, quality development is extremely difficult. A variety of market factors may combine to limit the number of homes that can be sold as part of one 'product' in a single location at any one time and too many housebuilders could create a 'battlefield' site with each developer fighting with each other to attract purchasers.
- 9.101 The Panel is not in a position to reach a firm conclusion on the extent to which such considerations may affect the housing target. Both the developers of the new settlement and the SPAs seemed confident that the build rate could be achieved. We would urge, however, that the imperative to achieve the build rate should not be at the expense of good design.
- 9.102 A related concern is achieving the target for affordable housing. This will be affected by the level and timing of private sales because of the link with developer contributions through Section 106 agreements and the need to integrate social housing with market

housing. It will also be dependent partly upon funding for social housing from the Housing Corporation. This reinforces the points made in Chapter 3 about Government playing its part in achieving the Strategy by providing the necessary level of resources.

- 9.103 Insofar as problems do arise in achieving the construction rates at Longstanton/Oakington, we cannot see that the situation would apply any differently at any of the other new settlement options. If there is a shortfall in meeting the 6,000 dwelling target by 2016 much will depend on the extent of undershooting. There is already a degree of flexibility built into the Plan (see Chapter 7) which would enable some re-phasing of the housing programme if necessary. The recommendations we have made in respect of an additional Green Belt release west of Trumpington Road and the possible expansion of Cambourne would add to this flexibility. If there was a very significant undershooting of the target which could not be dealt with through the normal processes of plan, monitor and manage, then there would be no option but to review the Plan.

ROLE OF THE NEW SETTLEMENT

- 9.104 There was a large measure of agreement among participants about the role of the new settlement, broadly supporting the concept as set out in Policy P9/4. In brief, it is envisaged that the new settlement should:

- achieve the status ultimately of a small town within the settlement pattern of the Sub-Region;
- contribute to achieving a better balance between houses and jobs in the Cambridge area by providing principally for the housing needs of the Sub-Region;
- contribute in particular to meeting the affordable housing needs of the area, including low cost key worker housing, assisted by proximity and accessibility to the city centre and the University and, via the Rapid Transit System, to Addenbrooke's in the south;
- develop also as a strategic employment location associated in particular with the high tech clusters in Cambridge, providing opportunities for innovation, new start-ups, 'grow on' production space and re-locations;
- provide additional employment based on serving the needs of local residents and those in the surrounding area;
- establish a retail and service function in keeping with its size, which does not put at risk the planned developments in Cambridge city centre nor threaten the maintenance of a level of services in the surrounding villages;
- be an example of excellence in the creation of a sustainable settlement, exhibiting a high level of technological innovation and a high quality built environment;
- maintain the village character of Longstanton and Oakington by providing green separation between the new development and the existing communities.

- 9.105 We strongly agree with the consensus of opinion that the new settlement should, over a period of time, develop a greater degree of self-containment, although it is inevitable in the early years that it will need to perform a strongly dormitory function. This will mean developing its employment base and its role as a service centre as it grows and thus providing more opportunities for people to live and work within the settlement, as well as seeking a better balance between in- and out-commuting.

- 9.106 There was some debate about the ultimate size of the new settlement. Policy P9/4 refers to it accommodating 6,000 dwellings by 2016, with capacity ultimately for 8,000 to 10,000 dwellings. Paragraph 9.32, however, is more categorical, stating that an ultimate size of 10,000 or thereabouts is considered appropriate. The developers indicated that there was capacity within the present development envelope for 8,000 dwellings, based on densities at the upper end of the PPG3 range (30-50 dwellings per hectare). To get to 10,000 or more would require a bigger land area. There are options for the physical expansion of the settlement, the developers' favoured direction of growth being to the north of Longstanton in an area well related to the Rapid Transit System and the proposed town centre¹².
- 9.107 We do not have a strong view on whether the ultimate size should be 8,000 or 10,000 dwellings. If there is scope for further growth this would be consistent with the RPG6 requirement that the new settlement should be designed with the capacity for further longer term expansion, if needed. In terms of sustainability we were told that the critical threshold is 8,000 dwellings, this being the level which will support a secondary school. Whether it should go beyond this is a matter best decided in the context of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and the preparation of the Master Plan, taking into account landscape and design issues and the possible impact on neighbouring communities. We do think that the apparent inconsistency between what Structure Plan Policy P9/4 and paragraph 9.32 say about the ultimate size of the new settlement should be addressed, either by deleting the reference to 8,000 dwellings in the policy or inserting a reference to 8-10,000 in the text.
- 9.108 Finally, in the context of the role of the new settlement in providing town centre and other facilities, it was suggested that the present wording of the Policy P9/4 was unduly restrictive in suggesting that it should cater only '*for the needs of the settlement rather than any wider area*'. We agree that this fails to recognise the role of the settlement in providing access to a wider range and choice of services and facilities for the surrounding villages. Accordingly, we recommend a slightly different form of wording in our recommendations below.
- 9.109 For consistency with our revised Policy P9/3c we have deleted the last sentence in paragraph four of the policy which refers to the extension of the Green Belt in the vicinity of Oakington. Any change to the Green Belt in this area needs to be considered in the wider context of a review of the outer boundary of the Green Belt generally (see Policy P9/3b).

RECOMMENDATION 9A

Retain Longstanton/Oakington as the preferred location for the new settlement.

Review the references to the ultimate size of the new settlement in Policy P9/4 and paragraph 9.32 to clarify whether the intended capacity should be 8-10,000 dwellings or 10,000 dwellings.

Amend the third paragraph of Policy P9/4 to read:

¹² New Settlement Master Plan Issues, prepared on behalf of Gallagher Estates by David Lock Associates, October 2002 (CD 6.2).

‘The new settlement will provide a well designed residential environment with social infrastructure, town centre and local facilities limited in size to cater for the needs of the settlement and the immediate surrounding area rather than the wider Sub Region’

Delete the last sentence of the fourth paragraph of Policy P9/4 referring to an extension of the Green Belt in the vicinity of Oakington.

Review, in the context of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, the contribution which Cambourne might make towards meeting the development requirements of the Sub-Region, through an increase in the ultimate size of the settlement to a more sustainable level.

CHAPTER 10

PETERBOROUGH AND NORTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE

- 10.1 Chapter 10 of the Structure Plan sets out the strategy for the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area. This area is dominated by the city of Peterborough, whose hinterland extends into the neighbouring counties of Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Rutland. The area contains most of Fenland District (including the market towns of Wisbech, March and Whittlesey), part of Huntingdonshire District (including Ramsey) and a small part of East Cambridgeshire District.

OVERALL STRATEGY

- 10.2 The vision for Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire, drawing upon the guidance in RPG6, is set out in paragraph 10.7 of the Structure Plan. The key points, in summary, are:
- realising the potential of Peterborough as a major focus of growth within the East of England;
 - building upon Hampton as the main location for future urban expansion in Peterborough;
 - maintaining and enhancing the transport infrastructure, with the emphasis on sustainable modes;
 - supporting the role of Wisbech and March as development locations and as sustainable economic and social centres for the surrounding areas;
 - regeneration of deprived areas, notably through maximising the opportunities for high quality, sustainable developments on vacant and underused sites.
- 10.3 No-one at the EIP questioned this overall strategy for the area and it is one which the Panel endorses. The strategy is reflected in a suite of policies in the rest of the chapter, covering:
- housing distribution (P10/1)
 - economic and social regeneration (P10/2)
 - market towns (P10/3)
 - economic role of Peterborough (P10/4)
 - Hampton (P10/5)
 - retail provision (P10/6)
 - transport (P10/7)
- 10.4 Below we deal with the first five of these policies. Retail provision (Policy P10/6) was not a matter before the EIP and we have dealt with transport issues (Policy P10/7) in Chapter 6.

HOUSING DISTRIBUTION (Policy P10/1)

- 10.5 Policy P10/1 provides for the construction of 22,700 homes in the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area between 1999-2016, distributed as follows: Peterborough 12,800; Fenland 6,600; Huntingdonshire 2,000; and East Cambridgeshire 1,300. The policy also indicates that Local Plans will identify a proportion of this provision to be in the form of affordable housing, in accordance with Policy P5/4.
- 10.6 As indicated in Chapter 5, the overall scale of provision is determined by the RPG6 70:30 apportionment of housing between the Cambridge Sub-Region and the Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area. It results in a reduction in house building in the latter area from around 1,400 dwellings per annum in recent years to 1,200 over the Plan period. In addition, the approach of seeking a greater concentration of development in the larger urban areas means that Peterborough will need to achieve a higher rate of development than in the past, whereas in the rural areas there will be a significant reduction in housing development.
- 10.7 This shift in the pattern of development has created some tension, not least because almost all of the housing requirement is already accounted for in existing housing commitments. Information provided by the SPAs¹ shows that, of the total provision of 22,700 dwellings needed over the Plan period, only 995 would require 'new' land, after allowing for completions, land with planning permission, land allocated in Local Plans and windfall/brownfield sites. All of the 995 residual requirement is in Peterborough, leaving little scope for the identification of new sites elsewhere. This is of particular concern in Fenland District and we discuss this in more detail below.

Peterborough

- 10.8 Peterborough is currently allocated 12,800 dwellings as its component of the total housing provision for the area over the period 1999-2016. A number of participants suggested that there was a case for increasing the level of housing provision to support the economy and provide a more sustainable pattern of development. It was pointed out that although the city was expected to attract 89% of the job growth, it had only been allocated 56% of the area's total housing provision. This would result in a jobs/housing imbalance, which ought to be redressed by reducing the allocations for East Cambridgeshire, Fenland and Huntingdonshire.
- 10.9 We do not think there is a need to review the housing allocation for Peterborough at this stage. There is no evidence to suggest that, to date, the housing supply side has restricted economic growth, or that, on the basis of past completion rates, insufficient provision has been made over the Plan period. Furthermore, if the allocation for Peterborough were to be increased this would have to be at the expense of the other Districts within the Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area. It was argued to us quite strongly that the other Districts, Fenland in particular, needed a higher not a lower level of housing provision in order to support the economic and social regeneration of the Market Towns.
- 10.10 However, we do consider that the pace of development of housing and jobs, both in Peterborough itself and in the surrounding area, should be closely monitored to ensure that sufficient housing is made available to match employment growth. Past rates of housing development in the city have been slower than anticipated, and below the level which will be necessary in the future if the expectations of the Structure Plan are to be

¹ Table 3.6, Technical Report Supplement, October 2002 (CD 1.3.1).

realised. Partly, this has been because some of the larger brownfield sites, including Hampton, have proved more difficult to bring forward than expected. This situation was exacerbated by the availability of more easily developable greenfield sites in adjoining local authorities, including in Lincolnshire, with the result that much of the city's housing need was met outside the city.

- 10.11 Following the greater emphasis in national guidance on the development of brownfield land, we were told that development plans in adjoining authorities in Lincolnshire are now aiming to restrict the release of greenfield sites to ensure that more development takes place on previously developed land in sustainable locations, including Peterborough. The Structure Plan is effectively seeking to do the same by reducing housing provision in areas close to Peterborough in Fenland and Huntingdonshire.
- 10.12 We are satisfied that the Structure Plan level of housing provision for Peterborough is appropriate, both in terms of seeking to meet the challenge set by RPG6 and in complying with the locational preference set out in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. There is ample land available or capable of being brought forward to meet this requirement, taking into account the opportunities for maximising urban development within the older parts of Peterborough. Later in this chapter we support a proposal to increase the design capacity at Hampton. We also heard from developers that there were a number of additional sites in and around Peterborough which could be released to help meet the requirement.
- 10.13 Although the average build rate of over 750 dwellings per annum is a figure which has not been realised in Peterborough over the past 10 years, there are good reasons to believe that it can be achieved in the future, especially now that Hampton has gained momentum. Consequently, we do not accept the argument of some participants that part of the Peterborough housing allocation should be re-allocated to Huntingdonshire or Fenland.

Huntingdonshire

- 10.14 It was put to us that the allocation of only 2,000 dwellings to that part of the Huntingdonshire District within the Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area is inadequate and unjustified. At past rates of completion this would result in the Plan provision being built out by 2006. We cannot accept a rationale for an increased level of housing based purely on past trends, which reflect allocations based on previous planning policies. This would be quite contrary to the plan, monitor and manage approach advocated by PPG3. Moreover, since the only settlement in this part of Huntingdonshire identified for development by the Structure Plan is the small Market Town of Ramsey, which is designated for a lesser scale of growth, this would be likely to perpetuate the siting of development in less sustainable locations.
- 10.15 In the next section we suggest that Ramsey should be added to the list of priority areas for economic and social regeneration in Policy P10/2. However, we do not think this necessitates a higher allocation of housing. Additional housing should not be viewed as an essential component for economic regeneration. It is important, as in the case of Chatteris, that there should be clear evidence of increasing jobs to justify further housing development. Otherwise, more housing is likely to exacerbate the already high level of out commuting. In this context, we note that the LPA is proposing to accept a recommendation by the Local Plan inspector to delete two major housing sites in Ramsey from the draft Local Plan.

- 10.16 In short, we can find no convincing argument for increasing the housing allocation in this part of Huntingdonshire and we therefore recommend that the Structure Plan figure should remain unchanged.

Fenland

- 10.17 In Fenland District the allocation of 6,600 dwellings is entirely accounted for by recent completions, land with planning permissions, land allocated in Local Plans and sites expected to come forward as windfalls. A number of participants, including the District Council, expressed concern that this was insufficient to meet the aspirations for growth and development in the Market Towns of Wisbech and March, both in terms of providing an adequate range of housing and the critical mass to attract further infrastructure investment and community benefits through developer contributions. Both of these towns are regarded as sustainable locations in their own right. Wisbech in particular acts as an employment centre for the surrounding area and has a significant level of in-commuting.
- 10.18 We have a certain sympathy with these concerns. The position of Fenland appears to have been particularly affected by the outcome of the split of the housing allocation in RPG6 between the Cambridge Sub-Region and the Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area. It is further complicated by the fact that one of Fenland's Market Towns, Chatteris, lies within the Cambridge Sub-Region and is allocated a portion of that Sub-Region's housing. Some participants questioned the scale of housing planned for Chatteris compared with March or Wisbech (see Chapter 7).
- 10.19 On the other hand, there is a danger that more housing in some of the Fenland communities will result in more long distance car commuting to Peterborough or Cambridge. It also appears from what we heard at the EIP that there may be scope for further reviewing the high level of existing housing commitments in the Local Plan and, as and when the opportunity arises, of not renewing existing planning permissions in less sustainable locations. The Structure Plan already indicates (paragraph 10.10) that allocations in villages and places such as Whittlesey, which rely heavily on commuting to Peterborough, will need to be carefully considered. This may provide scope for re-allocating housing provision to the Market Towns of March and Wisbech, should they be considered to need additional housing as a mechanism for encouraging investment and meeting the needs of employment growth.
- 10.20 As we have noted in Chapter 5, the total level of housing allocated to Fenland District as a whole would require an average annual build rate (around 470 dwellings per annum) not very dissimilar to that experienced over the last 10 years or so. On balance, we conclude that there is not a sufficiently strong case to justify any change to Fenland's housing allocation in Policy P10/1.

East Cambridgeshire

- 10.21 Only a small part of East Cambridgeshire District lies within the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area. The only sizeable settlement in this part of the District is Littleport, which lies a few miles north of Ely. We were told that housing commitments in Littleport account for practically the whole of the 1,300 dwellings allocated to this part of East Cambridgeshire. Since a high proportion of this total (just under 1,000 dwellings) is already the subject of planning permissions, the scope for re-allocating housing appears to be limited. However, should future monitoring show that all these commitments do not come forward for development, or if there is scope for reviewing unimplemented land

allocations, we consider that the allocation of 1,300 dwellings to this part of the area should be reviewed, since we do not consider Littleport to be as sustainable a location for new development as the Market Towns elsewhere within the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area.

- 10.22 To summarise, we are not recommending any changes to the figures in Policy P10/1. Looking to the future, however, we do consider that the broad split of housing between the Cambridge Sub-Region and the Peterborough/North Cambridgeshire area may need to be reviewed in the context of the forthcoming RPG14. This should take into account further analysis of trends in jobs, housing and commuting in the two areas and the scope for sustainable development in Peterborough itself and in the Market Towns. It should also take into account the cross-boundary interaction between Peterborough and the neighbouring areas in Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Rutland.
- 10.23 The only changes required to Policy P10/1 are to amend the first sentence to refer to ‘22,700 additional homes’ rather than ‘the construction of 22,700 homes’ for consistency with Policies P5/1 and P9/2, and to add a paragraph referring to the intention to prepare Supplementary Planning Guidance on phasing as referred to in our recommendations on Policy P5/1.

RECOMMENDATION 10A

Amend the first sentence of Policy P10/1 to refer to ‘22,700 additional homes’ rather than ‘the construction of 22,700 homes’ and add a paragraph referring to the intention to prepare Supplementary Planning Guidance as referred to in Recommendation 5A.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL REGENERATION (Policies P10/2 and P10/4)

- 10.24 It is convenient to deal with Policies P10/2 and P10/4 together because they are closely related. Both met with a strong degree of support at the EIP.
- 10.25 Policy P10/2 identifies the priority areas for economic and social regeneration as: the inner areas of Peterborough, Wisbech, March and rural areas that have EU transitional area status.² The policy also indicates the measures which will be taken by LPAs and other partners in supporting regeneration in these areas. These include, inter alia, ensuring an adequate supply of employment land, improving transport accessibility, protecting and enhancing infrastructure and facilities, and training, education and other support services.
- 10.26 Policy P10/4 sets out the proposals to strengthen economic growth in Peterborough, through encouraging employment opportunities in the City centre, reinforcing established employment clusters, further development of high quality business parks and development of the University.
- 10.27 No-one disputed the emphasis on Peterborough as the focus for employment provision and as a key retail centre within the wider region. Policy P10/4 reflects the challenges set by RPG6 (Policy 17) for Peterborough, to promote economic growth and regeneration and to make greater use of vacant, under-used and derelict land. The relatively diverse

² In addition to March and Wisbech and the surrounding areas, this includes Chatteris and Littleport (in East Cambridgeshire).

economy in Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire, where land supply is less of an issue than in the Cambridge Sub-Region and where levels of traffic congestion are less of a problem, can cater for a wider range of employment, including warehousing and distribution, call centres and manufacturing industries. As we indicate in Chapter 4, in Peterborough there are opportunities for developing a cluster of expertise around environmental industries and services, whilst the FoodFen partnership provides the basis for building upon the agri-food industry in the fens. Although the previous strategy of shifting activity associated with research and development and high-tech industry northwards into the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area has met with limited success, this remains a worthwhile part of the economic strategy, using the ‘stepping stone’ approach referred to in Chapter 7 of our Report.

- 10.28 We have dealt in Chapter 4 with issues raised during discussion concerning the range and quality of employment land. In Hampton alone there are over 100 hectares of employment land available, capable of accommodating up to 13,000 jobs. As indicated in chapter 4, it is also likely that much of the growth in employment in coming years will be in sectors not so reliant on major new employment land allocations – in retailing, transport, education, health care and office-based occupations. In this connection, we support points made by participants about the importance of mixed use developments in places like Hampton and other new areas of development, and within the urban areas. All this is well reflected in the relevant policies of the Structure Plan and does not require any further emphasis. The key task is to translate this guidance into Local Plan policies, and into masterplans and development briefs.
- 10.29 Turning to Policy P10/2, we agree with Huntingdonshire District Council that Ramsey should be considered as a further priority area for regeneration. We note that it was included in the list of areas in the extant Structure Plan where priority was to be given to promoting economic and employment growth. Ramsey is relatively distant from either Peterborough or Cambridge, communications are poor and it has had little success hitherto in attracting jobs. Although identified in Policy P1/1 as a Market Town for a lesser scale of growth it is clearly most in need of employment development rather than housing. We do not see the justification for giving it any less priority in economic regeneration terms than Chatteris, which benefits from a policy of its own within the Cambridge Sub-Region and is more accessible. Whilst we appreciate the need to avoid dissipating resources and effort on regeneration across too many areas, we are satisfied that Ramsey should be included in the list of priority areas.

RECOMMENDATION 10B

Add Ramsey to the priority areas for economic and social regeneration in Policy P10/2.

No change to Policy P10/4

MARKET TOWNS (Policy P10/3)

- 10.30 Policy P10/3 identifies Wisbech and March as key Market Towns within Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire, where development will consolidate their role as employment and service centres and enable them to become foci of public transport. In the case of Whittlesey and Ramsey, the policy indicates that new development should aim to

encourage appropriate small to medium scale employment opportunities and provide limited and small scale new housing development appropriate to their roles as centres for the surrounding areas. This is consistent with their designation in Policy P1/1 as Market Towns where a lesser scale of growth is justified.

- 10.31 Wisbech and March are indisputably important Market Towns for their surrounding area and no one at the EIP questioned the role identified for them. Neither was there any serious questioning of the status attributed to Ramsey which, as indicated above, is less well placed than the other Market Towns to support major growth. On the other hand, it was suggested by one or two participants that there was no evidence to justify the inferior status accorded to Whittlesey. Here it was felt additional development should be allowed in order to assist its economic and social development and to attract developer support for addressing the problems of congestion on the A605 through the town. It was also argued that limiting housing growth at Whittlesey would not guarantee that further development of March and Wisbech would necessarily follow.
- 10.32 We note that Whittlesey has a population of over 15,000, more than that of Ely and significantly greater than Ramsey or Chatteris. However, we are not convinced that this justifies according it the same status as the other Market Towns. It has a much smaller retail centre than Wisbech, March or Ely and it experiences high levels of out-commuting as a result of its proximity to Peterborough.³ Within the Fenland District, March and Wisbech have a greater likelihood of supporting sustainable development in view of their greater distance from Peterborough, and serving as they do significantly greater hinterlands. For these reasons we agree with paragraph 10.10 of the Structure Plan that it may be desirable to review existing housing commitments in places like Whittlesey. Accordingly, we support the designation of Whittlesey as a town for lesser growth in Policies P1/1 and P10/3.
- 10.33 On a small point of detail, the SPAs agreed to an amendment to the last bullet point of Policy P10/3, relating to Whittlesey and Ramsey, namely to delete the word ‘additional’ before ‘new housing development’. We agree that the present wording is somewhat ambiguous in that it may seem to imply that additional housing over and above existing commitments is justified. This is clearly not the case and we therefore endorse this change.

RECOMMENDATION 10C

Amend Policy P10/3 by deleting the word ‘*additional*’ from the last bullet point.

HAMPTON TOWNSHIP (Policy P10/5)

- 10.34 As indicated earlier, Hampton Township, to the south of Peterborough, constitutes the biggest strategic development in this part of the Structure Plan area. Following its slow build up, it is expected to make a major contribution to the development needs of Peterborough within the Plan period. Policy P10/5 sets the context for its further development, with an allocation of 5,200 additional dwellings to 2016 and an indication of the principles on which future development should be based, including the promotion of mixed development.

³ Technical Report Supplement, Section 6 (CD 1.3.1).

- 10.35 Following discussion between the developers and Peterborough City Council, it was agreed that the figure of 5,200 dwellings could be augmented by a further 2,000 dwellings, including provision for development beyond 2016. This is based on an upward revision of the housing densities (from an average of 25 dwellings per hectare in the original Masterplan to around 32 dwellings per hectare), the redrawing of development parcel boundaries, redressing the imbalance between housing and employment land, and other changes to the disposition of land uses within the Masterplan. There were no objections to this proposal and the Panel agree that it is fully in accord with the overall strategy for the Structure Plan and with national planning guidance regarding urban extensions and making the best use of land. We therefore support the proposal to amend the first bullet point in Policy P10/5 to reflect this change.
- 10.36 This increase in the design capacity for Hampton does not affect the overall housing requirement for Peterborough and it is not intended that the additional dwellings will necessarily be delivered by 2016. This is a matter for the normal processes of plan, monitor and manage through the Local Plan. We agree with the SPAs that this should be made clear in the supporting text which should indicate that the additional capacity is identified in order to assist in the proper long term planning of the township.
- 10.37 We were also asked to consider whether the Plan should explicitly recognise the need for additional strategic releases of land on the fringes of Peterborough, notably by including an additional policy (or reference in the text) relating to Stanground South. We were told that Stanground South is allocated for development in the revised deposit version of the Peterborough Local Plan and has the support of the City Council. With a potential of between 1,350 and 1,600 dwellings we do not regard this site as being of the same strategic importance as Hampton. Bearing in mind the guidance in PPG12 on the level of detail appropriate in structure plans, we agree with the SPAs that the identification of Stanground South is a matter for the Local Plan rather than this Structure Plan.

RECOMMENDATION 10D

Amend the first bullet point of Policy P10/5 to read:

‘• the completion of the 5,200 dwellings currently provided for and the identification of any further housing capacity (including provision for development beyond 2016) in the order of 2,000 dwellings.’

In the supporting text explain the rationale for the additional 2,000 dwellings, indicating that the additional capacity is identified in order to assist in the long term planning of Hampton and will not necessarily be delivered by 2016.

CHAPTER 11

RURAL ISSUES

11.1 Rural issues are dealt with specifically in three policies in the Plan. These are:

- Policy P2/6 which deals with the Rural Economy;
- Policy P3/4 which addresses Rural services and facilities; and
- Policy P5/5 which provides guidance on Homes in Rural Areas.

At the EIP rural matters were discussed in a session which also considered Market Towns and Rural Centres. We have dealt with the main issues raised in relation to Market Towns and Rural Centres elsewhere in this Report – namely in Chapters 2 (Development Strategy), 5 (Housing), 7 (Cambridge Sub-Region) and 10 (Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire). In this chapter we focus upon the issues arising in relation to the above policies.

11.2 In addition, one further matter was discussed at the EIP, namely Policy P7/3 which refers to Countryside Enhancement Areas. We deal with this matter following the discussion on the above rural policies. Before we examine these policies, however, we address a general issue raised by GO-East as to whether the Plan adequately addresses the economic and social needs of the rural areas and, in particular, those in the north of the County.

RURAL POLICY

11.3 It was suggested by GO-East that a number of the policies, focusing on the location of employment (P2/2), the rural economy (P2/6) and rural services and facilities (P3/4) might usefully be amalgamated under the umbrella of an over-arching economic policy, of which the rural economy would form one element.

11.4 The SPAs considered this suggestion but discounted it in favour of making changes to Policies P2/1 and P2/2 and their supporting text (SPA Supplement 26). These place a greater emphasis on aspects of the rural economy by making explicit reference to diversification (in Policy P2/1); highlighting the importance of supporting rural services and facilities (Policy P2/2); and referring to the role of rural centres as locations for employment (Policy P2/2). GO-East supported these changes which also include appropriate cross-references to other relevant policies. The Panel see no reason to take a contrary view and we have included the relevant recommendations to Policies P2/1 and P2/2 and their accompanying text in Chapter 4.

RURAL ECONOMY (Policy P2/6)

11.5 Policy P2/6 sets out the framework against which employment proposals in rural areas will be assessed. Employment growth will be facilitated on an appropriate scale where it contributes to one or more of the following objectives:

- helping to achieve a balance of employment with the type and quantity of local housing;

- helping to provide linkages with new or existing business or research and technology clusters;
- providing opportunities for home working or making good use of new information and communication technologies;
- enabling farm or rural diversification where appropriate to the local area, including appropriate rural tourism;
- enabling the re-use of existing buildings, and vacant, derelict or under-used land within villages, and;
- helping to maintain or renew the vitality of rural areas.

The policy requires that employment allocations within local plans will be predominantly located in Rural Centres.

11.6 Three issues arise as a result of the discussion at the EIP:

- the appropriateness of cluster development in rural areas;
- whether there is any conflict between rural diversification and environmental protection; and
- whether Policy P2/6 is consistent with PPG 7 regarding the re-use of buildings.

Cluster Development

11.7 A number of participants expressed concern about giving encouragement to the development of business clusters in rural areas. Business and technology clusters can assist in promoting a healthy rural economy. Indeed, Policy 12 of RPG6 requires policies to be included in Development Plans to *'build on the strengths of rural areas by encouraging business development and the development of local business clusters'*. The types of developments associated with clusters can vary widely, from major trip generators such as the large complexes to the south of Cambridge, to small-scale and single person businesses which may benefit from the linkages associated with clusters. We heard that businesses of this type are forming in the Fenland areas.

11.8 However, the desirability of encouraging the spread of the 'Cambridge Phenomenon' into the more rural parts of the Structure Plan area via the 'stepping stone' approach should not be at the expense of a sustainable quality of life in rural areas and, in particular, lead to unnecessary travel. Thus, we agree with those who felt that the phrase *'on an appropriate scale'* should be replaced by the phrase which is used in the text at paragraph 2.36, ie *'sensitive small-scale'*. This would give the policy greater clarity and reassure those who fear that the policy could lead to a proliferation of inappropriate development in rural areas. We also support the suggestion of the SPAs that the reference to *'helping to provide linkages'* with new or existing businesses in the second bullet point of the policy should be replaced with the word *'supporting'*. This is a more comprehensive term which better reflects the fact that the relationships between such businesses are more than simply about linkages.

11.9 We do not agree that the policy is too restrictive to cluster development. As far as clusters are concerned, Policy P2/4 is the primary policy for dealing with cluster development and we deal with this in Chapter 4.

Rural Diversification

- 11.10 The NFU put the case that Policy P2/6 is not sufficiently supportive of farming and farm diversification, having regard to other policies in the Plan, such as those relating to the Green Belt and environmental designations. In paragraph 2.37 the Plan recognises that *'Farm diversification can enhance employment opportunities in the countryside'* and it goes on to give examples of the type of diversification which farmers might engage in. It is appropriate for the Plan to provide a policy framework which delivers both rural/farm diversification and protection of the environmental qualities of the rural area. We see nothing in the policy which would place unreasonable burdens or restrictions on farmers.
- 11.11 We do not agree with those who sought to argue that this policy is too restrictive to employment development generally. In our view, Policy P2/6, as we propose to amend it, provides an appropriate balance between delivering rural employment and protecting the character of rural areas.

Re-use of buildings

- 11.12 GO-East were concerned that the fifth bullet point of the policy does not properly reflect the advice in PPG7 regarding the re-use of buildings. Paragraph 3.14 of PPG7 states that *'There should be no reason for preventing the conversion of rural buildings (including modern buildings) for business re-use subject to'* and the advice sets out a number of factors to be taken into consideration. These include a provision that *'if buildings are in the open countryside they are capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction'*. Clearly, there is no intention in national policy to restrict the re-use of buildings to those within villages. The Countryside Agency drew attention to the fact that diversification in rural employment may be needed in the countryside as well as in settlements. The re-use of buildings in accordance with the guidance in PPG7 can be a sustainable way of providing rural employment.
- 11.13 The SPAs argued that, because Policy P2/6 seeks to facilitate re-use, there is no conflict with PPG7. Whilst we see no need for the policy to repeat the advice in PPG7 we think it unhelpful for it to imply that re-use of buildings is restricted to those in villages. Thus, we propose that the fifth bullet point be divided so that only the re-use of vacant, derelict or under-used land is limited to that within villages. We note the point made that national policy on the re-use of land generally refers to housing (via PPG3). However, we see no reason why support should not also be given to re-using such land for employment purposes.

Other Matters

- 11.14 It was suggested that there should be scope for improving the jobs/housing imbalance which exists in some settlements which have quite large populations but only limited employment opportunities; examples given were Linton and Sawston with populations of about 4,000. Whilst the principle of self-sustaining communities is desirable, it is unrealistic to expect that all settlements can achieve a balance between jobs and housing. We have supported the strategic approach to development in the Structure Plan area which is predicated upon concentrating most development in the main urban areas whilst allowing Rural Centres some development which will help to provide sustainable communities within rural areas. In our view, the balance of the Plan is about right and there is no justification for allowing significant employment growth in rural areas generally.

RECOMMENDATION 11A

Delete ‘Growth of employment’ and ‘on an appropriate scale’ and replace with ‘Sensitive small-scale employment development’ in the first paragraph of Policy P2/6.

Replace the words ‘helping to provide linkages’ with the word ‘supporting’ in the second bullet point in Policy P2/6 and replace the word ‘or’ with the word ‘and’ between ‘new’ and ‘existing’ and between ‘business’ and ‘research’.

Separate the fifth bullet point of Policy P2/6 so that ‘enabling the re-use of vacant, derelict or underused land within villages’ becomes a separate bullet point.

RURAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES (Policy P3/4)

11.15 Policy P3/4 advises local authorities to support the vitality of rural communities by encouraging the retention and expansion of village shopping facilities and key community services. PPG 6 provides guidance on the approach to be adopted regarding shopping in rural areas (paras 3.20-3.22), and the principle of recognising the role that village shops can play, in economic and social terms, in maintaining villages as viable communities. Detailed advice is given on the need to take a positive approach towards proposals, such as extensions to shops, that could enhance their viability. PPG7 reiterates the national objectives of improving the viability of existing villages and market towns and the need to reverse the general decline in rural services, by promoting living communities.

11.16 There was general support for Policy P3/4 and its approach to encouraging new, and retaining existing, services and facilities, which generally reflects the guidance referred to above. However, it was agreed by the SPAs that shopping facilities ought to be limited to ‘a scale appropriate to their location and serving a local function’. This is necessary to ensure that:

- shopping facilities in villages do not lead to unnecessary trip generation;
- villages do not develop shopping facilities on a scale which would compete with larger more sustainable locations.

Whilst the SPAs suggested that this clarification could be included in the supporting text to the policy, in our view, it is a matter which ought to be covered in the policy itself.

11.17 We understand the problems of accessing services in rural areas and the reliance on car-borne travel. However, we do not believe that a more flexible approach to car-dependent development needs to be taken, as suggested to us. Such an approach would not be consistent with Government advice about the need to minimise travel by car (PPG13). The approach of the Structure Plan, that employment, shopping, leisure facilities and services should be sited in locations where there is a greater degree of access via existing public transport, or where proposed improvements to the public transport network will increase access, accords with this advice.

11.18 PPG 13 (paragraph 41) also addresses the issue of access in remoter areas, advising that services and facilities should be located in or near to local service centres to ensure that they are served by public transport. It suggests that these centres might be market towns, large villages or a group of villages. The latter two categories appear to broadly fit with

the role of Rural Centres in the Plan. Accordingly, we have no reason to believe that the Plan has failed to address adequately the issue of accessibility to rural facilities and services.

RECOMMENDATION 11B

Insert ‘on a scale appropriate to their location and serving a local function’ after ‘shopping facilities’ in Policy P3/4.

HOUSING IN RURAL AREAS (Policy P5/5)

11.19 Policy P5/5 sets out the approach to the scale of new housing outside the Market Towns and Rural Centres. In accordance with national policy guidance in PPG 3, the Plan takes a restrictive approach to the provision of housing in rural areas. Small-scale housing developments will be permitted in villages only where appropriate, taking into account:

- the need for affordable housing;
- the character of the village and its setting; and
- the level of jobs, services, infrastructure, and passenger transport provision in the immediate area.

11.20 The issues raised by participants broadly fall into three categories:

- whether the Plan would enable sufficient housing provision to assist in maintaining rural services and facilities and counteract social exclusion;
- whether it is sufficiently flexible in respect of the provision for housing in rural areas, outside the Rural Centres, to meet local need; and
- whether the upper limit of eight dwellings specified in paragraph 5.22 is adequately justified.

Social Exclusion

11.21 The issues raised in relation to social exclusion concern access to local services and facilities and the lack of a sufficient supply of affordable housing to meet local need. We are sympathetic to the need to arrest the decline of rural services and facilities, but we were informed that national research revealed little evidence of a direct link between the provision of additional housing and the retention of these. PPG 3 is quite explicit with regard to the pattern of new housing development, with the emphasis being on locating new development in urban areas. It advises that ‘...*only a limited amount of housing can be expected to be accommodated in expanded villages*’ (paragraph 69). It is our view that there is insufficient justification for a significant increase in housing in the smaller rural settlements.

11.22 It was argued that a greater level of housing in the rural areas would assist in achieving the critical mass necessary to make the retention or provision of additional services and facilities, such as health centres, economically viable. We appreciate that, in the remoter rural areas, persons wishing to access, for example, health care facilities may have to travel longer distances, often by private car. However, this is a problem that needs to be

addressed through improvements to the range and frequency of public transport provision (in the context of Policy P8/6), rather than as justification for providing additional housing.

Local Housing Need

- 11.23 We heard that healthcare provision is also hampered by problems of staff recruitment and retention, much of which has arisen from the shortage of affordably priced housing. The issue of accommodation for key workers falls within the scope of the wider subject of affordable housing, our recommendations on which are set out in Chapter 5 of this report. However, as in the urban areas, the level of affordable housing in rural areas will need to be identified and justified by robust and up-to-date housing needs surveys. So far as Policy P5/5 is concerned it specifically recognises the need for affordable housing as one of the categories of development likely to be appropriate in villages.
- 11.24 However, the statement in paragraph 5.22 of the Plan '*small-scale housing development to meet local needs*' (our underlining) merely serves to confuse as it is not the intention of Policy P5/5 to restrict all new housing in rural areas to that required to meet local needs. We propose to delete reference to local needs from paragraph 5.22 so as to ensure consistency with the policy.
- 11.25 In the interests of clarity, and to avoid any potential confusion with the reference to Policy P1/1 in the preceding paragraph (5.21), we also recommend that paragraph 5.22 should be amended by replacing '*This policy*' in the opening sentence by '*Policy P5/5*'.

Scale of Housing in Rural Areas

- 11.26 Several participants raised concerns over the inclusion in paragraph 5.22 of an upper limit of eight dwellings for developments in small settlements. It was argued that, if this is a matter of policy it ought to be in P5/5 and not in the supporting text. We are unconvinced that a specific figure should remain in the Plan. Notwithstanding its inclusion within the previous Structure Plan¹, we agree with those who felt that the figure is arbitrary, inflexible and over-prescriptive and fails to take account of the characteristics of individual villages. For example, such an approach would appear to rule out appropriate schemes for affordable housing of more than 8 dwellings on previously-developed land, which might otherwise accord with other policies in the Plan. In our view, given the wide variety of villages in the Structure Plan area, the interpretation of '*small-scale housing development*' is a matter more suitable for determination through the Local Plan process. We are satisfied that there are sufficient safeguards in PPG 3 to ensure that development of an inappropriate scale does not occur in the smaller settlements.

RECOMMENDATION 11C

No change to Policy P5/5.

Modify paragraph 5.22 by:

- Replacing the words '*This policy*' in the opening sentence with the words '*Policy P5/5*';

¹ Chapter 3 'Settlement', paragraph 3.5 defines a Housing Group as '*Normally up to 8 dwellings forming a planning entity...*' (CD 1.1)

- **Deleting ‘(no more than 8 dwellings)’ and ‘to meet local needs’.**

COUNTRYSIDE ENHANCEMENT AREAS (Policy P7/3)

- 11.27 Policy P7/3 encourages the promotion of schemes for quiet recreation and biodiversity enhancement within specified Countryside Enhancement Areas (CEAs) identified in Figure 7.1 of the Plan. These comprise ‘*Areas where biodiversity enhancement will be sought*’ and ‘*Areas where Recreation and Access Schemes will be sought*’. These areas are considered to have the potential for appropriate recreational activities and habitat enhancement. The emphasis is on non-vehicular access and discouraging motor traffic and noisy activities. It is envisaged that the SPAs will work with other organisations to identify schemes and other measures in order to realise the policy aims.
- 11.28 The CEAs provoked a considerable amount of interest from participants. Issues arising from the discussion on this topic are:
- whether there is a sufficiently robust rationale underpinning the selection of the areas identified, and why enhancement should be limited to these areas;
 - whether the aims of habitat enhancement, increased public access and recreation, and the promotion of a working countryside are mutually compatible; and
 - whether the Plan should identify additional sites to be designated as CEAs.

Rationale and criteria

- 11.29 In terms of the ‘*Areas where biodiversity enhancement will be sought*’, the principle concern was whether the identification of the areas in Figure 7.1 sends out the wrong message, implying that the ‘white’ areas are not considered to be as environmentally valuable as the designated areas. There was also discussion about the derivation of the areas identified.
- 11.30 In relation to the first point, we note the concern of those who felt that biodiversity enhancement should not be restricted to specified areas but should be sought across the Structure Plan area as a whole. However, we note that Policy P7/3 is one of a suite of policies dealing with the environment, of which Policy P7/2 addresses the issue of the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity in relation to development proposals. As stated in paragraph 7.6 of the Plan ‘*This policy seeks to ensure the protection and enhancement of the wider countryside and not limit protection to designated sites*’. Clearly, this policy should ensure that the concerns of those who fear that Policy P7/3 will create a two tier approach should not be realised.
- 11.31 Policy P7/3 is intended to be a proactive and enabling policy which should help to ensure that any funding which may be available for biodiversity enhancement, other than that directly associated with a particular development, can be targeted to achieve maximum benefit rather than spread more thinly. In our view, this accords in general terms with the guidance in Policy 41 of RPG6 that LPAs ‘*should take positive action to achieve the targets set in national and local Biodiversity Action Plans*’. Accordingly, we support the inclusion of the policy in the Plan, but we believe that it would aid clarity to retitle the key to Figure 7.1 to read ‘*Target areas for habitat creation*’ instead of ‘*Areas where biodiversity enhancement will be sought*’.
- 11.32 Turning to the derivation of the areas identified in Figure 7.1 and listed in paragraph 7.9, we were referred to the ‘50 Year Wildlife Vision for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

for people...². In relation to this vision, we understand that much work has been done on biodiversity enhancement initiatives, involving local authorities and other organisations associated with the county-wide Biodiversity Action Plan Partnership, such as the RSPB, English Nature, the Wildlife Trust and the National Trust. We see merit in the Structure Plan giving a policy focus to this work by reflecting the Partnership's vision. We are satisfied that the work done by the Partnership provides a sufficiently robust basis for the identification of the broad areas shown in the Plan.

- 11.33 A matter of concern to many of the LPAs is the interpretation of these areas at the Local Plan level. Clearly sites already the subject of specific initiatives should be able to be identified at the local level with little difficulty. As to defining the boundaries of the broader areas referred to in paragraph 7.9, we were assured that there is information available from a variety of sources for the CEAs in Fig 7.1 to be transcribed onto Local Plan Proposals Maps. LPAs might then wish to use Supplementary Planning Guidance to flesh out the precise measures required for appropriate habitat creation, similar to the approach used in transcribing the Landscape Character guidelines.
- 11.34 Turning to the '*Areas where Recreation and Access Schemes (ARAS) will be sought*' we are not convinced that the hatched areas in Fig 7.1 have a robust justification. The SPAs advised us that they were based, inter alia, on the network of public footpaths, proximity to settlements, river valleys and access by rail. On the basis of these criteria, it is inconsistent that the hatched areas have excluded, for example, the immediate surroundings of Cambridge. We also note that paragraph 7.9, refers to the areas shown on Figure 7.1 as including '*existing areas open for public access and which are already recognised for their nature conservation value*'. It is apparent that many of the hatched areas are not co-terminous with biodiversity enhancement areas, either existing or planned.
- 11.35 We agree with, and support, the value of ensuring that appropriate access is provided in CEAs. However, we believe that the inclusion of the ARAS designation on Figure 7.1 (ie the hatched areas) merely serves to confuse the policy. It would be difficult to transcribe this part of Figure 7.1 at the local level. In our view, the identification of ARAS locations is best left to the LPAs to determine in the context of Policy P7/3 and the recreation policies in Chapter 4 of the Plan, in particular Policy P4/2. We suggest that most of the text in paragraph 7.11 might usefully be relocated to Chapter 4 and Policy P4/2 might also include some reference in the policy or the text to Policy P7/3. As Chapter 4 was not discussed at the EIP we leave it to the SPAs to decide on the most appropriate way of dealing with these matters.

Conflicting Land Uses

- 11.36 It was suggested that there can be conflict between encouraging access and enhancing biodiversity and we were asked to consider dealing with the access issues in a separate policy. Clearly, there are some recreational activities, such as quad-biking, which would be likely to have an adverse effect upon sensitive habitats and we agree that such activities should be discouraged in these areas. Nevertheless, the policy does refer to '*schemes for quiet recreation*' which seems to us to preclude the type of activity which would cause such conflict. There appeared to be a general consensus that careful management is the key to ensuring that access and biodiversity enhancement are not incompatible. We do not support separating access out from the policy entirely as we see

² Produced in October 2002 by the Biodiversity Partnership for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. (CD2.27).

this as a fundamental part of the concept of the CEAs. The SPAs suggested an additional sentence be included in the policy that *‘where there is potential for conflict between these objectives site management measures should be put in place’* (SPA Supplement 34). We support the intention but see no need for it to be in the policy. We suggest the words be added to paragraph 7.9.

- 11.37 Particular concern was raised on behalf of the farming industry that the policy might harmfully impact upon their businesses and affect the economic well-being of rural areas. In our view, paragraph 7.12 adequately addresses this point as it makes clear that CEAs should not *‘adversely affect the economy of rural areas’*. Nevertheless, we support the suggestion by the SPAs that the second sentence in paragraph 7.12 be amended to read *‘They should provide additional opportunities for farm diversification and for increased prosperity by attracting more visitors to the countryside’* (SPA Supplement 34). This should help to reassure the farming community.
- 11.38 A further concern related to the phrase *‘noisy human activity’* which was thought to be vague and potentially inhibiting to farm related activities. The SPA clarified that the aim of this part of the policy is to discourage inappropriate recreational activities. The policy needs to be amended to reflect this stance by substituting the word *‘recreational’* for *‘human’*. We propose that the policy should also make it clear in relation to the discouragement of motor traffic that this relates to *‘non-essential’* traffic, ie not that which is needed to carry out farming or other appropriate activities in such areas. Finally, we agree with the SPAs who proposed that the word *‘and’* in the second part of the third sentence in the existing policy be replaced by *‘or’* (SPA Supplement 34) so that it reads *‘should be discouraged or appropriately managed’*.

Designation of Other Sites

- 11.39 A number of additional sites were suggested for mention as CEAs in paragraph 7.9, such as areas close to Cambridge and the Gog Magog hills. However, the Structure Plan is not the place to be too specific about sites. It should broadly indicate the areas within which CEAs will be identified in Local Plans. Provided these broad areas are sufficiently comprehensive the LPAs can decide which sites should be defined at the local level. We think that the list in paragraph 7.9 is pitched at an appropriate level of detail and does not need amending.

Other Matters

- 11.40 We think that the policy should state at the outset that LPAs will define CEAs in their Local Plans and it should then go on to clarify their purpose. We have redrafted the policy to make this clearer. We see no need for the second sentence to be in the policy and recommend that it be relocated to the supporting text, although we have retained the reference to landscape enhancement. We also see no need for the policy to limit the identification of areas where motor traffic may be discouraged to *‘in the long term’*. It will be for LPAs to decide when to implement this provision.
- 11.41 We were also asked to consider a minor amendment to Policy P7/2 dealing with Biodiversity, namely the insertion of the word *‘significantly’* before *‘enhance’*. As this policy was not one specifically identified for examination at the EIP we make no recommendation on this suggestion.

RECOMMENDATION 11D**Redraft Policy P7/3 as follows:**

‘Countryside Enhancement Areas will be identified in Local Plans. Within these areas particular emphasis will be given to the promotion of schemes for quiet recreation and biodiversity and landscape enhancement. Access to them by foot or cycle will be preferred and localities may be identified where non-essential motor traffic and noisy recreational activity should be discouraged or appropriately managed. The County Council and Peterborough City Council will work with relevant organisations to identify appropriate schemes and other measures required to implement this policy.’

Relocate the second sentence of the policy into the supporting text after the bullet points in paragraph 7.9, deleting the word ‘The’ at the beginning of the sentence. Also replace the words ‘Countryside Enhancement Areas’ with the word ‘these’ in the sentence starting with the words ‘The recognition’.

Add the following new sentence after the second sentence in paragraph 7.9: *‘Where there is potential for conflict between the biodiversity and access objectives of Policy P7/3 site management measures should be put in place’.*

Delete the hatched ‘Areas where Recreation and Access Schemes will be sought’ from Figure 7.1 and retitle the key to read ‘Target areas for habitat creation’ in place of ‘Areas where biodiversity enhancement will be sought’.

Move the first sentence in paragraph 7.11 to the end of paragraph 7.10 and relocate the rest of that paragraph to Chapter 4 and put a cross reference in Chapter 4 (in Policy P4/2 and/or supporting text) to Policy P7/3.

Replace the second sentence in paragraph 7.12 with the following: *‘They should provide additional opportunities for farm diversification and for increased prosperity by attracting more visitors to the countryside’.*

CHAPTER 12

SUMMARY OF PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
CHAPTER 1		
P1/1	<p>Approach to Development</p> <p><i>The great majority of land for new development will be located:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• within Cambridge and Peterborough consistent with the role and character of those cities;</i> <i>• as expansion of Peterborough, and as expansion of Cambridge subject to changes to the Green Belt boundary;</i> <i>• through the creation of a small town at Longstanton/Oakington close to Cambridge;</i> <i>• in, and where appropriate adjoining, the Market Towns of Chatteris, Ely, Huntingdon, March, St. Ives, St. Neots, Wisbech and on a lesser scale Ramsey and Whittlesey.</i> <p><i>Local Plans may provide for a limited proportion of the overall development provision to take place at identified Rural Centres on a scale appropriate to the size, location and function of such centres, especially where it can make a contribution to the specified social and economic needs of those communities or to groups of communities.</i></p> <p><i>When identifying sites for development in Local Plans at each of the above locations, or when reviewing commitments or assessing development proposals, Local Planning Authorities will apply the following selection criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• provision involving the use of previously developed land and buildings within existing settlements should be afforded the highest priority;</i> <i>• provision within existing settlements should be preferred over the use of land outside settlements, subject to the need to safeguard important open spaces;</i> 	2A

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> on the periphery of settlements previously developed land and buildings should be preferred over the use of land that has not been developed previously. <p><i>In all cases development should be located where travel distances by car can be minimised, walking and cycling encouraged and where good public transport accessibility exists or can be provided.</i></p>	
1.15	Replace the second sentence with the following: <i>'the strong sequential preference set out in RPG Policies 4 and 22 has influenced the choice of locations for development and the site selection criteria in Policy P1/1'.</i>	2A
1.17	Add <i>'and employment opportunities'</i> after <i>'secondary school'</i> .	2A
1.18	Include at the end of the second sentence <i>'(see Policies P2/6, P3/4 and P5/5)'.</i>	2A

CHAPTER 2

P2/1	<p>Policy P2/1 - Employment Strategy</p> <p><i>The economic growth of the Plan area will be supported: In the Cambridge Sub-Region by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> encouraging the continued expansion of high technology and knowledge-based industry securing investment in new infrastructure needed to relieve obstacles to growth using existing land allocations and making new allocations where appropriate the selective management of employment which does not need to be located in or close to Cambridge (see Policy P9/8) <p><i>In Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> securing investment in physical infrastructure and supporting social, environmental and community initiatives which will assist economic regeneration taking full advantage of the range of existing land allocations and vacant and underused sites in the area 	4B
-------------	---	----

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><i>In both areas by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>encouraging a wider range of business and industrial development</i> • <i>developing the skills of the labour force in line with the needs of the economy</i> • <i>enabling the diversification of the rural economy (see Policy P2/6).</i> 	
2.17	Insert a new final sentence to read: <i>'Diversification will maximise opportunities to maintain incomes and employment in rural areas'.</i>	4B
P2/2	<p>General location of Development</p> <p><i>Where there is a need for new land allocations for employment, provision will be mainly concentrated in Cambridge, in Peterborough, in Market Towns and in Rural Centres where this could help reduce out-commuting, and also on the strategic sites identified in Policy P2/3.</i></p> <p><i>Local Plans will review existing allocations and allocate a range of sites for the continued growth of employment and to broaden the local economy. Development will be located in line with the objectives of Policy P1/1 so as to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(i) work towards a balance of jobs and housing</i> <i>(ii) maintain a range of types and sizes of premises for business requirements</i> <i>(iii) encourage a range of employment opportunities for local people</i> <i>(iv) reduce the need to travel, particularly by private car</i> <i>(v) enable the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling for work-related journeys</i> <i>(vi) maximise the use of previously developed land and buildings</i> <i>(vii) support rural services and facilities (see Policy P3/4).</i> 	4C
2.19-2.21	Include in the supporting text to Policy P2/2 details of the allocation of employment land between the LPAs, as set out in the revised SPA Supplement 4, with the caveat that these figures are indicative only.	4A

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
2.19	Delete the first sentence and replace with: <i>'While there is currently enough employment land to cater for the projected growth additional strategic employment land is proposed in order to maintain the momentum of the 'Cambridge Phenomenon'.'</i>	4C
2.21	Insert <i>'and rural centres'</i> after <i>'market towns'</i> into the second sentence.	4C
P2/3	<p>Strategic Employment Locations</p> <p><i>Strategic Employment sites in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough will be provided where there are good transport links, a locally available labour supply and the potential for business or industrial expansion. Locations are as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>land at Alconbury Airfield will provide an opportunity for a strategic employment development during the Plan period, either for the existing distribution and transport related proposals or other appropriate uses;</i> <i>the new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington will provide a key opportunity for new employment associated with high technology clusters in the Cambridge Sub-Region;</i> <i>land at Hampton will give high profile encouragement to investment in the Peterborough area;</i> <i>March Trading Park will be promoted to improve marketability and generate investment for the market town and its surrounding area;</i> <i>The south-west approach to Wisbech will be promoted, with environmental enhancements, to improve marketability and generate investment for the market town and surrounding area;</i> <i>on land to be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in accordance with Policy P9/3c, at locations close to Addenbrooke's, between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road and at Cambridge Airport, for mixed use developments including the expansion of education and research facilities;</i> <i>land at Chatteris will assist in the economic regeneration of that town and act as a stepping stone for spreading the economic benefits of the 'Cambridge Phenomenon' northwards.</i> 	4D
2.24	Replace the first sentence with: <i>'The new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington will accommodate businesses primarily serving local needs and the needs of the Sub-Region, including possible re-locations from Cambridge (see Policy P9/4).'</i>	4D
2.27	Replace paragraph 2.27 with: <i>'The strategic employment locations on the edge of Cambridge included in land to be released</i>	4D

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<i>from the Green Belt are allocated for mixed-use development including the expansion of education and research facilities. Paragraphs 9.23-9.26 consider the role of these expanded communities in more detail.'</i>	
P2/4	Development and Expansion of Employment Clusters No change	4E
2.29	Add: <i>'A key role will be played by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the Greater Peterborough Partnership in implementing this policy. Both Partnerships are supported by government, local authorities, businesses and other statutory and voluntary agencies. It is recognised that business clusters extend beyond the boundary of the Structure Plan area and joint working (and marketing) across county boundaries is essential to ensuring their successful development.'</i>	4F
P2/6	Rural Economy <i>Sensitive small-scale employment development in rural areas will be facilitated where it contributes to one or more of the following objectives:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>helping to achieve a balance of employment with the type and quantity of local housing</i> • <i>supporting new and existing businesses and research and technology clusters (see Policy P2/4)</i> • <i>providing opportunities for home working, or making good use of new information and communication technologies</i> • <i>enabling farm or rural diversification where appropriate to the local area, including appropriate rural tourism (see Policies P4/1 and P4/2)</i> • <i>enabling the re-use of existing buildings</i> • <i>enabling the re-use of vacant, derelict or under-used land within villages</i> • <i>helping to maintain or renew the vitality of rural areas.</i> <i>Employment allocations in local plans for rural areas will be predominantly located in Rural Centres (see Policy P1/1).</i>	11A

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.																
CHAPTER 3																		
P3/4	<p>Rural services and facilities</p> <p><i>Local planning authorities will support the vitality of rural communities by encouraging the retention and expansion of village shopping facilities, on a scale appropriate to their location and serving a local function, and key community services.</i></p>	11B																
CHAPTER 5																		
P5/1	<p>Housing Distribution</p> <p><i>Provision will be made in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough for 70,200 additional homes between 1999-2016 to be distributed as follows:</i></p> <table><tr><td><i>Area</i></td><td><i>Total</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Cambridge City</i></td><td><i>12,500</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>East Cambridgeshire</i></td><td><i>7,300</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Fenland</i></td><td><i>8,100</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Huntingdonshire</i></td><td><i>9,500</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>South Cambridgeshire</i></td><td><i>20,000</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Peterborough</i></td><td><i>12,800</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Total</i></td><td><i>70,200</i></td></tr></table> <p><i>Supplementary Planning Guidance will set out the phasing of development during the Plan period and allow for development needs continuing beyond 2016. Policies in Local Plans will set out the more detailed phasing of housing provision.</i></p>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Cambridge City</i>	<i>12,500</i>	<i>East Cambridgeshire</i>	<i>7,300</i>	<i>Fenland</i>	<i>8,100</i>	<i>Huntingdonshire</i>	<i>9,500</i>	<i>South Cambridgeshire</i>	<i>20,000</i>	<i>Peterborough</i>	<i>12,800</i>	<i>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Total</i>	<i>70,200</i>	5A
<i>Area</i>	<i>Total</i>																	
<i>Cambridge City</i>	<i>12,500</i>																	
<i>East Cambridgeshire</i>	<i>7,300</i>																	
<i>Fenland</i>	<i>8,100</i>																	
<i>Huntingdonshire</i>	<i>9,500</i>																	
<i>South Cambridgeshire</i>	<i>20,000</i>																	
<i>Peterborough</i>	<i>12,800</i>																	
<i>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Total</i>	<i>70,200</i>																	
P5/2	<p>Re-using previously developed land and buildings</p> <p><i>Between 1999 and 2016 at least 50% of new dwellings will either be located on previously developed land or will utilise existing</i></p>	5B																

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.												
	<p><i>buildings. Provision within each local planing authority will seek to achieve or surpass the following targets*:</i></p> <table><tr><td><i>Cambridge City</i></td><td><i>55%</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>East Cambridgeshire</i></td><td><i>25%</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Fenland</i></td><td><i>30%</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Huntingdonshire</i></td><td><i>40%</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>South Cambridgeshire</i></td><td><i>35%</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Peterborough</i></td><td><i>75%</i></td></tr></table> <p><i>If monitoring shows that the targets are not being met local planning authorities should take appropriate action to encourage the bringing forward of previously developed land.</i></p> <p>* These targets to be reviewed prior to the publication of the Modifications to ensure that they will deliver the overall target of at least 50%.</p>	<i>Cambridge City</i>	<i>55%</i>	<i>East Cambridgeshire</i>	<i>25%</i>	<i>Fenland</i>	<i>30%</i>	<i>Huntingdonshire</i>	<i>40%</i>	<i>South Cambridgeshire</i>	<i>35%</i>	<i>Peterborough</i>	<i>75%</i>	
<i>Cambridge City</i>	<i>55%</i>													
<i>East Cambridgeshire</i>	<i>25%</i>													
<i>Fenland</i>	<i>30%</i>													
<i>Huntingdonshire</i>	<i>40%</i>													
<i>South Cambridgeshire</i>	<i>35%</i>													
<i>Peterborough</i>	<i>75%</i>													
5.6	Add: ‘Policy P1/4 provides the mechanisms for the Plan, Monitor and Manage process which will be critical to ensuring the delivery of the targets set in Policy P5/2.’	5B												
5.7	Insert: ‘Annex C to PPG3 ‘Housing’ defines previously developed land’ at the end of paragraph.	5B												
5.8	Add ‘It is recognised that delivery of the build rate in the Cambridge Sub-Region may lead to the targets in Policy 5/2 being achieved later rather than earlier in the Plan period’.	5B												
5.9	Redraft paragraph to reflect recommendation on Policy P5/2.	5B												
	Establish a consistent and agreed method of monitoring in consultation with the LPAs.	5B												
P5/3	<p>Density</p> <p><i>The average density of new housing development will need to be increased across the Structure Plan area in order to maximise efficiency in the use of sites. In setting density standards appropriate to their area Local Planning Authorities should take into account the following guidelines:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Densities of at least 40 dwellings per hectare should be sought in locations close to a good range of existing or potential services and facilities and where there is, or there is the potential for, good public transport accessibility.</i>	5C												

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>In appropriate locations in or close to the centres of Cities and Market Towns and in planned new communities, and in locations with access to high quality public transport services, significantly higher densities should be sought.</i> <i>Densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare will not be acceptable.</i> <p><i>Local Planning Authorities should seek to maximise the use of land by applying the highest density possible which is compatible with maintaining local character.</i></p>	
5.14	Delete the last sentence.	5C
	Redraft the supporting text to reflect the revised policy and make it clear that the densities referred to are net, as defined in Annex C of PPG3.	5C
P5/4	<p>Meeting locally identified needs</p> <p><i>Local Plans should make provision to meet the locally assessed need for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>affordable housing, including key worker housing;</i> <i>one and two bedroom homes;</i> <i>housing suitable for the elderly and those with mobility problems;</i> <i>other specific groups, including students, the homeless, travellers and gypsies.</i> 	5D
5.17	Delete the words ' <i>although they are likely to be within an indicative range of 30-50%</i> '.	5D
5.18	Insert the word ' <i>discounted</i> ' before ' <i>low cost market housing</i> '.	5D
P5/5	<p>Homes in Rural Areas</p> <p>No change</p>	11C
5.22	Delete ' <i>This policy</i> ' in the opening sentence and replace with ' <i>Policy P5/5</i> '. Delete ' <i>(no more than 8 dwellings)</i> ' and ' <i>to meet local needs</i> '.	11C

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
CHAPTER 6		
P6/1	<p>Development-related Provision</p> <p><i>Development will only be permitted where the additional infrastructure and community requirements generated by the proposals can be secured, which may be by condition or legal agreement or undertaking.</i></p> <p><i>Local Plans should include appropriate policies and identify the key infrastructure requirements in their site specific policies.</i></p>	3A
New Para	Include an additional paragraph in the supporting text to Policy P6/1 – Development-related Provision, based on SPA Supplement 31, as follows: <i>‘Achieving the rate of high quality development and transport infrastructure required by 2016 will require a tightly managed programme of implementation – carefully phased over the Plan period. There will be a close interdependency between major infrastructure projects and housing development. As circumstances change the programme will need to be adapted and kept up to date. For this reason a detailed programme cannot usefully be included in the Structure Plan at this stage. However, a broad indication of phasing in relation to delivery of infrastructure is given in the relevant sub-regional chapters.’</i>	5A
6.1	Amend text to include reference to <i>‘environmental improvements’</i> .	3A
6.4	Amend the last sentence to refer to <i>‘key site-specific infrastructure requirements.’</i> Add after this <i>‘Infrastructure in this context means both capital projects and/or service improvements’</i> .	3A
CHAPTER 7		
P7/3	<p>Countryside Enhancement Areas</p> <p><i>Countryside Enhancement Areas will be identified in Local Plans. Within these areas particular emphasis will be given to the promotion of schemes for quiet recreation and biodiversity and landscape enhancement. Access to them by foot or cycle will be preferred and localities may be identified where non-essential motor traffic and noisy recreational activity should be</i></p>	11D

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<i>discouraged or appropriately managed. The County Council and Peterborough City Council will work with relevant organisations to identify appropriate schemes and other measures required to implement this policy.</i>	
7.9	Relocate the second sentence of the policy into the supporting text after the bullet points in paragraph 7.9, deleting the word 'The' at the beginning of the sentence. Also replace the words 'Countryside Enhancement Areas' with the word 'these' in the sentence starting with the words 'The recognition'. Add the following new sentence after the second sentence: 'Where there is potential for conflict between the biodiversity and access objectives of Policy P7/3 site management measures should be put in place'.	11D
Fig 7.1	Delete the hatched 'Areas where Recreation and Access Schemes will be sought' from Figure 7.1 and retitle the key to read 'Target areas for habitat creation' in place of 'Areas where biodiversity enhancement will be sought'.	11D
7.11	Move the first sentence in paragraph 7.11 to the end of paragraph 7.10 and relocate the rest of that paragraph to Chapter 4 and put a cross reference in Chapter 4 (in Policy P4/2 and/or supporting text) to Policy P7/3.	11D
7.12	Replace the second sentence with the following: 'They should provide additional opportunities for farm diversification and for increased prosperity by attracting more visitors to the countryside'.	11D

CHAPTER 8

P8/1	<p>Sustainable Development – links between land use and transport</p> <p><i>Local Planning Authorities should include policies in their Local Plans to ensure that new development:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>is located in areas that are, or can be made, highly accessible to public transport, cycle and on foot;</i> <i>is designed to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car;</i> <i>provides opportunities for travel choice;</i> <i>provides for the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users;</i> 	6A
------	--	----

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety. <p><i>In rural areas there may be instances where small-scale development, which is provided for under Policies P2/6, P3/4 and P5/5, is unable to be located in an area which is or can be made highly accessible to public transport. In such circumstances developments should be located and designed so far as possible to meet the remaining requirements of the policy.</i></p>	
P8/2	<p>Implementing sustainable transport for new development</p> <p><i>New development will be required to make provision for integrated and improved transport infrastructure, to increase the ability to move by cycle, public transport and on foot.</i></p> <p><i>Travel Plans will be required to accompany new non-residential developments and expansion of existing non-residential developments as a means of reducing car dependency and promoting alternative modes of travel.</i></p>	6B
8.14	Add at the end of paragraph 'Policy P6/1 deals with development related provision'.	6B
P8/3	<p>Area Transport Plans</p> <p>No change</p>	6C
8.18	Insert after the third sentence: 'This process will include extensive public consultation as part of the Area Transport Plan development'.	6C
P8/4	<p>Managing demand for car travel</p> <p><i>Local Authorities will introduce appropriate measures to manage demand for car travel into and within Cambridge, Peterborough and the Market Towns. These measures are likely to include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>reallocation of roadspace to be used by public transport, pedestrians and cyclists;</i> <i>restrictions on access by private car;</i> <i>fiscal measures.</i> 	6D

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
8.19	<p>Add the following paragraph: <i>‘Demand management is critical to the success of the strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region and it is likely that all of the measures in Policy P8/4 will be required. The Local Transport Plan will examine the range of measures necessary to ensure that the major development proposed for Cambridge does not lead to greater congestion and to the failure of the proposed rapid transit system and other public transport measures to deliver reliable, fast and frequent access into and across the city. This will include examining the need for fiscal measures such as workplace parking charges and/or congestion charging’.</i></p>	6D
P8/5	<p>Provision of parking</p> <p><i>Parking standards for all new development will be expressed as maximum standards and will be set in Local Plans. Lower levels of parking provision may be required:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• where means of travel other than the private car are available or can be provided;</i> <i>• where the need for high density development associated with central facilities limits the potential for car parking.</i> <p><i>Parking standards for non-residential development should not exceed the standards specified in PPG13. In Cambridge, Peterborough and the Market Towns parking standards for non-residential development below PPG13 standards should be achieved where shared parking is possible.</i></p>	6E
P8/6	<p>Improving bus and community transport services</p> <p><i>Public transport services will be identified in bus strategies and developed across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Key elements will include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• A network of High Quality Public Transport Services (as defined below*):</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>- within the urban areas of Cambridge and Peterborough, with priority over other motor traffic;</i> <i>- as high frequency, direct services concentrated on main corridors between the cities and the market towns, with segregated lanes and/or bus priorities where required to avoid congestion.</i> <i>• Good local services for market towns and feeder services linking rural areas to urban centres. Where necessary and</i> 	6F

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><i>possible, appropriate measures should be provided to ensure that such services have priority over other motor traffic.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Community transport to meet social needs.</i> <p><i>New development will be designed to maximise accessibility by bus and will be required to contribute towards these elements.</i></p> <p><i>*A High Quality Public Transport Service is defined as:</i></p> <p><i>(1) one that provides at least a 10 minute frequency during the peak periods and a 20 minute frequency inter-peak. If a parallel rail service of half hourly frequency is provided, the service would meet the high quality standard if the accompanying bus service was at least 15 minute frequency in the peak period and 30 minute frequency inter peak. During evenings and weekend, lower frequencies are likely to prevail¹.</i></p> <p><i>(2) One that provides, high quality, low floor/easy access buses, air conditioning, prepaid/electronic ticketing, real time information and branding to encourage patronage.</i></p> <p>¹ Formulate a minimum level of service for evenings and weekends</p>	
P8/7	<p>Improvements to rail services</p> <p><i>Local Authorities will work closely with the rail industry to bring forward service enhancements and new infrastructure to increase rail use and the proportion of freight moved by rail. Priority will be given to improvements which are feasible to serve existing and planned developments or which will effect a significant transfer from road based travel. Former rail routes with the potential for re-use as transport corridors will be identified in Local Plans and protected.</i></p>	6G
P8/8	<p>Encouraging walking and cycling</p> <p>No change.</p>	6H
8.34	<p>Add the following sentence: <i>‘In addition, the enhancement of walking and cycling routes to and from and within Countryside Enhancement Areas is vital to the enjoyment of those areas’.</i></p>	6H
	<p>SPAs to consider including the following under Strategic Objective 4 ‘Performance of development’: <i>‘achieve an increase in walking and cycling’.</i></p>	6H

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
P8/9	<p>Provision of public rights of way</p> <p><i>The use of the public rights of way network will be encouraged by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>protecting the existing definitive map routes from development;</i> • <i>integrating new and existing routes into new development;</i> • <i>providing links to key activities in town and village centres and to educational establishments, public open spaces and to Countryside Enhancement Areas.</i> • <i>Local Highway Authorities will continue to update and review the definitive map.</i> 	6I
P8/10	<p>Transport investment priorities</p> <p><i>Implementation of the following transport schemes will be sought over the Structure Plan period to meet strategic requirements and the needs of major developments:</i></p> <p>Rapid Transit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A rapid transit network to serve key centres in the Cambridge Sub-Region, initially between Cambridge and Huntingdon utilising the former St Ives railway line and between Trumpington and Cambridge city centre.</i> <p>Multi-Modal Studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Schemes recommended in the preferred plan for the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon (CHUMMS) corridor, including on and off line improvements to the A14 and other agreed measures;</i> • <i>Other schemes appropriate to the development strategy, arising from the multi-modal studies for the A47 Norwich to Peterborough corridor and the London and South Midlands corridor (LSMMS).</i> <p>Buses:</p> <p><i>Development of a comprehensive and high quality network of bus services across the Structure Plan area comprising:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>a network of high quality bus services from Market Towns and Rural Centres into Cambridge and Peterborough and local</i> 	6L

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><i>services for intermediate areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>improved links between Market Towns and their rural hinterlands</i> • <i>provision of improved travel information across the Structure Plan area including real time information</i> • <i>bus priorities on key radial routes into Cambridge, Peterborough and the Market Towns</i> • <i>bus priorities on orbital routes around Cambridge</i> • <i>designation of Primary Public Transport Corridors in Peterborough</i> <p>Rail: <i>The provision of enhanced local rail services and improved links to the wider rail network.</i> <i>Strategic schemes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>West Anglia Route Modernisation and enhancements</i> • <i>Completion of Thameslink 2000</i> • <i>East Coast Mainline upgrade, including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Peterborough Station improvements</i> - <i>improving access to the Lincoln lines</i> - <i>providing extra tracks south of Peterborough</i> • <i>Improvements to the Felixstowe-Nuneaton rail route, including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>upgrading to increase freight capacity</i> - <i>extending the line between Ely junction and Soham</i> - <i>possible electrification and station enhancement between Ely and Peterborough</i> • <i>East West rail route through Cambridge</i> 	

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><i>Local Schemes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Major improvement to Cambridge station including additional platforms and passenger facilities</i> • <i>Chesterton rail station and interchange including link to the rapid transit system, utilising the former St Ives railway line</i> • <i>New rail station at Hampton</i> • <i>Upgrade of Whittlesey station</i> • <i>Addenbrooke's rail station</i> • <i>Improved station facilities* and access for the disabled</i> <p><i>Cycling and walking:</i> <i>Measures to increase the capacity, usage and safety of pedestrian and cycle routes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Extension of the Core Traffic Scheme and pedestrianisation with appropriate facilities for cyclists in Cambridge</i> • <i>Completion of 'Sustrans' long distance cycle network</i> • <i>Completion of cycle networks within, around and to Cambridge, Peterborough, Market Towns and Rural Centres</i> • <i>Cycle and footpath links between villages</i> <p><i>Park and Ride and Interchanges</i> <i>Improvements that will increase the efficient operation of the whole transport system:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>park and ride sites for Cambridge, Peterborough, Market Towns and other locations</i> • <i>rural transport interchanges close to or between Cambridge, Peterborough and the Market Towns</i> • <i>new and improved high quality interchange facilities in Cambridge City Centre, Peterborough, Market Towns and other locations</i> • <i>new high quality bus/rail interchanges at Cambridge and Peterborough rail stations</i> 	

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>interchanges on the Cambridge to Huntingdon rapid transit system</i> <p>Local roads <i>Localised and strategic improvements to reduce environmental impact, improve safety and efficiency and maintain economic prosperity:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A605 Peterborough to Whittlesey Schemes including Stanground Bypass and Kings Dyke bridge (to replace level crossing), Whittlesey</i> • <i>A1073 Spalding to Eye improvement (jointly between Peterborough and Lincolnshire County Council)</i> • <i>A142 Ely Southern link road</i> • <i>A142 Fordham By pass**</i> • <i>A1198 Papworth Everard Bypass**</i> • <i>other schemes with significant environmental benefits</i> • <i>A10 route improvements including replacement of Foxton level crossing by a bridge</i> • <i>Peterborough parkway junction improvements</i> • <i>access road from Hauxton Road to Clay Farm and Addenbrooke's</i> <p>Trunk Roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A14 west of A1 junction improvements</i> • <i>A428 between Cambridge and St. Neots (A1) - Caxton Common to Hardwick includes developer contribution</i> • <i>A47 Thorney By pass</i> • <i>Short term Trunk Road schemes yet to be identified as part of Route Management Programmes</i> <p><i>During the Structure Plan period attention will be given to localised safety, environmental and congestion issues on the remainder of the highway network. Where individual transport schemes contribute towards the objectives of this Plan and</i></p>	

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><i>targets established through Local Transport Plans, they will be supported subject to the outcome of scheme appraisals and availability of funding.</i></p> <p><i>* such schemes include the possibility of a new station in or to the north of Peterborough</i></p> <p><i>** both of these schemes will be retained unless construction has commenced at the time of adoption of the Structure Plan</i></p>	
P8/11	<p>Provision for the movement of freight and lorry parking</p> <p><i>The transfer of freight from road to rail or water will be encouraged. Where this is not possible, provision will be made for the efficient movement of heavy goods vehicles on primary and distributor roads with minimum environmental disruption and avoiding environmentally sensitive areas.</i></p> <p><i>Rail depots and private rail sidings for the transshipment of freight including sites that cease to be used will be protected in Local Plans.</i></p> <p><i>Sites should be identified in Local Plans for transshipment depots and lorry parks where there is an identified need.</i></p>	6J
8.42	Insert 'are of particular importance to the delivery of modal shift of freight transport from road to rail and they' after 'interchange sites. Add new sentence: 'Land at Alconbury Airfield, identified in Policy P2/3 may be suitable for a major rail facility'.	6J
8.43	Delete the word 'is' in the first line and replace with 'appears to be' and put a full stop after 'Wisbech' and replace the remaining text with the following: 'Any feasibility studies investigating the potential for achieving a route for freight to Peterborough using the River Nene and associated waterways will also be encouraged.'	6J
New Para.	Insert the following as a new paragraph after paragraph 8.43: 'Freight Quality Partnerships are a useful tool in delivering freight modal shift. The Cambridgeshire Freight Quality Partnership exists but is not currently operating.'	6J
P8/12	<p>Air Services</p> <p>Delete policy.</p>	6K
8.44	Delete paragraph and replace with the following:	6K

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><i>'The Government have produced a document 'The Future of Air Transport in the United Kingdom: South East' which considers Alconbury Airfield as a possible site to provide a substantial dedicated air freight provision, an express parcel hub, third party aircraft maintenance and low cost passenger operations. It also assumes an aircraft maintenance facility equivalent in size to that at Marshall Aerospace Cambridge. This document is the subject of consultation until July 2003 following which an Air Transport White Paper will be produced. This will determine whether a regional airport facility will be required for the Plan area. The issues likely to be relevant to the consideration of the location of any such airport are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• the impact of noise and/or disturbance on residents with particular reference to night-time flying;</i> <i>• the need for transport infrastructure improvements and services related to the generation of trips to and from any such facility and the need to minimise the use of the private car for such trips by providing high quality public transport access;</i> <i>• the ability of the local area to accommodate the economic impact;</i> <i>• environmental issues including any urbanising impact;</i> <i>• the potential to accommodate the relocation of the aerospace activity at Cambridge Airport, if required.'</i> 	
CHAPTER 9		
P9/1	<p>Development Strategy – Cambridge Sub-Region</p> <p>Delete policy.</p>	7A
New Para	<p>Set out the following vision early in Chapter 9 under the sub-heading 'Vision for the Cambridge Sub-Region':</p> <p><i>'The vision for the Cambridge Sub-Region is that it will continue to develop as a centre of excellence and world leader in the fields of higher education and research and it will foster dynamism, prosperity and further expansion of the knowledge-based economy spreading outwards from Cambridge, whilst protecting and enhancing the historic character and the setting of Cambridge as a compact city, the character and setting of the Market Towns and other settlements in the Sub-Region, and the important environmental qualities of the surrounding area. Sustainable and spatially concentrated patterns of high quality, socially inclusive development will be focussed on Cambridge, in the form of new communities on the edge of the city and in</i></p>	7A

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<i>one or more new settlements, and in the Market Towns, to provide a more sustainable balance between jobs and homes. Integrated transport systems related closely to the development patterns in the Sub-Region, including high quality public transport networks, will deliver more sustainable travel patterns. An attractive, ecologically rich and accessible countryside will be facilitated. Development will be delivered by means of a co-ordinated approach which maximises and integrates the different sources of investment.'</i>	
	Consider giving this vision some form of presentational emphasis by, for example, highlighting the text or putting it in a box.	7A
	Insert the diagrammatic vision for the Cambridge Sub-Region as shown on SPA Supplement 29, amended to delete reference to the area of housing restraint to the south of the city.	7A
	Insert a new sub-heading ' <i>Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region</i> ' to follow the vision statement and incorporate thereunder the current text in paragraphs 9.4, 9.9 and 9.11-9.13, appropriately edited to avoid repetition, using bullet point format. All elements of the strategy must be covered in the context of the vision. Insert appropriate cross-references to the appropriate policies which provide the means by which the strategy will be implemented.	7A
P9/2	<p>Housing Distribution – Cambridge Sub-Region</p> <p><i>Provision will be made for 47,500 additional homes in the Sub-Region between 1999 and 2016, with the following indicative distribution:</i></p> <p>[Continued on the next page]</p>	7B

Policy No.	Revised Policy						Rec No.																																										
	<table><tr><th>District</th><th>Cambs</th><th>South Cambs</th><th>East Cambs</th><th>Hunts</th><th>Fenland</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>Within the built up area of Cambridge</td><td colspan="2">6,500 2,400 └───┘ 8,900</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>8,900</td></tr><tr><td>Edge of Cambridge subject to review of Green Belt boundary</td><td colspan="2">6,000 2,000 └───┘ 8,000</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>8,000</td></tr><tr><td>New settlement at Longstanton /Oakington</td><td></td><td>6,000</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>6,000</td></tr><tr><td>Market Towns, Previously Established New Settlements and Rural Centres</td><td></td><td>9,600</td><td>6,000</td><td>7,500</td><td>1,500*</td><td>24,600</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>12,500</td><td>20,000</td><td>6,000</td><td>7,500</td><td>1,500</td><td>47,500</td></tr></table>						District	Cambs	South Cambs	East Cambs	Hunts	Fenland	Total	Within the built up area of Cambridge	6,500 2,400 └───┘ 8,900					8,900	Edge of Cambridge subject to review of Green Belt boundary	6,000 2,000 └───┘ 8,000					8,000	New settlement at Longstanton /Oakington		6,000				6,000	Market Towns, Previously Established New Settlements and Rural Centres		9,600	6,000	7,500	1,500*	24,600	TOTAL	12,500	20,000	6,000	7,500	1,500	47,500	
District	Cambs	South Cambs	East Cambs	Hunts	Fenland	Total																																											
Within the built up area of Cambridge	6,500 2,400 └───┘ 8,900					8,900																																											
Edge of Cambridge subject to review of Green Belt boundary	6,000 2,000 └───┘ 8,000					8,000																																											
New settlement at Longstanton /Oakington		6,000				6,000																																											
Market Towns, Previously Established New Settlements and Rural Centres		9,600	6,000	7,500	1,500*	24,600																																											
TOTAL	12,500	20,000	6,000	7,500	1,500	47,500																																											
	<p><i>* 500 dwellings of this allocation are subject to improving job prospects in Chatteris, in accordance with Policy P9/6.</i></p>																																																
	[Continued on the next page]																																																

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><i>In identifying sites for development local planning authorities will give preference to the most sustainable locations, in accordance with the criteria set out in Policy P1/1.</i></p> <p><i>The figures for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire are shown combined because these local planning authorities will work together to determine the most appropriate form and phasing of development on the edge of Cambridge, in order to meet the overall requirement for housing within Cambridge and in locations which are subject to Green Belt review.</i></p> <p><i>Supplementary Planning Guidance will set out the phasing of development during the Plan period and allow for development needs continuing beyond 2016. Policies in local plans will set out the more detailed phasing of housing provision.</i></p> <p><i>[30%]* or more of the new housing in the Sub-Region will be affordable, including key worker housing. All housing development of more than 15 dwellings or on residential sites of more than 0.5ha. will be expected to contribute to this provision. Employment developments will also be expected to contribute towards affordable housing through developer contributions, in accordance with Policy P9/9.</i></p> <p><i>* The figure of 30% should be reviewed and amended in the light of the Sub-Regional Housing Needs Study.</i></p>	<p>5A</p> <p>5D</p>
New Para.	<p><i>Add a further paragraph to the supporting text of the Structure Plan, after paragraph 9.17, as follows: ‘The indicative housing figures for the Districts in the Cambridge Sub-Region are based in whole (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire) or in part (East Cambridgeshire, Fenland and Huntingdonshire) on the forecast capacity for development across the whole of the Sub-Region, in accordance with the development sequence set out in Policy P1/1. Should monitoring demonstrate that any stages in the development sequence are significantly under-achieving on what the Plan anticipates, then the housing figures for the whole of the development sequence in the Cambridge Sub-Region will be reviewed and the housing figures for each District amended as necessary in accordance with Policy P1/1. The mechanism for undertaking such a review will be the Stakeholder Partnership’.</i></p>	5A/7B
9.18	Amend references to affordable and key worker housing to accord with changes to policy.	7B

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
New Para	<p>Include at the beginning of the section on the Green Belt the following vision of the city and the qualities to be safeguarded:</p> <p><i>‘The vision for Cambridge is of a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre. Apart from its unique historic character, of particular importance to the quality of the city are the green spaces within it, the green corridors which run from open countryside into the urban area, as indicated on the Key Diagram, and the green separation which exists to protect the integrity of the necklace of villages. All of these features, together with views of the historic core, are key qualities which are important to be safeguarded in any review of Green Belt boundaries.’</i></p>	8A
P9/3a	<p>Policy P9/3a – Green Belt</p> <p><i>A Green Belt will be maintained around Cambridge which will define the extent of urban growth. The purposes of this Green Belt are to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic City with a thriving historic centre;</i> <i>• maintain and enhance the quality of its setting;</i> <i>• prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the City.</i> <p><i>Within the Green Belt, new development, including change of use, will be limited to that required for agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport, cemeteries, or other uses appropriate to a rural area.</i></p> <p><i>The Local Planning Authorities will jointly draw up strategies for the active management of the Green Belt for biodiversity, outdoor recreation and farm diversification appropriate to the Green Belt.</i></p>	8A
9.24	<p>Revise by deleting the second sentence and replacing it with the following and relocate the paragraph to follow the vision:</p> <p><i>‘This Plan provides for three expanded communities within the context of the overall vision. These are focussed on the University in West/North-West Cambridge, on Addenbrooke’s in the south and on the airport site to the east. A fourth expanded community focussed on the Northern Fringe is already committed.’</i></p>	8A
P9/3b	<p>Policy P9/3b – Review of Green Belt boundaries</p> <p><i>Local Planning Authorities will carry out a review of the Green Belt in their areas to identify the boundaries of land to be</i></p>	8B

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><i>released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in the locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/3c.</i></p> <p><i>In determining the boundaries of the areas to be released from the Green Belt the Local Planning Authorities will:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>retain any areas required to maintain the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in Policy P9/3a in the context of delivering sustainable development and planned settlement form;</i> <i>have regard to the compact form of the City;</i> <i>provide green separation between existing settlements and any urban expansion of Cambridge to maintain the identity of the individual settlements;</i> <i>ensure the protection of green corridors running from open countryside into the urban area as generally indicated on the Key Diagram;</i> <i>maintain views of the historic core.</i> <i>provide, where appropriate, for limited development in identified Rural Centres in accordance with Policy P1/1</i> <p><i>The Local Planning Authorities will review the outer boundary of the Green Belt to determine if additional areas can be identified which serve the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt and should be included within it, having regard to new settlement proposals.</i></p>	
9.26	Revise paragraph to reflect the up-to-date position and include the following within any redrafted text: <i>'It is expected that the green corridors and green separation referred to in Policy P9/3b will be retained within the Green Belt'.</i>	8B
P9/3c	<p>Location and Phasing of Development Land to be released from the Green Belt</p> <p><u>Location</u></p> <p><i>Local Plans will make provision for housing and mixed-use development on land to be released from the Green Belt in accordance with the principles set out in Policy P9/3b and in the following locations as shown on the Key Diagram:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>North of Newmarket Road;</i> 	8C

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>North of Cherry Hinton;</i> • <i>South and West of Addenbrooke's Hospital;</i> • <i>East and south-east of Trumpington;</i> • <i>West of Trumpington Road;</i> • <i>Cambridge Airport;</i> • <i>Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road;</i> • <i>Between Maddingley Road and Huntingdon Road.</i> <p><u>Purpose</u> <i>These areas will include locations for the 8,000 dwellings which will be required by 2016. They will help to deliver the vision of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic City by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>promoting a sustainable and spatially concentrated pattern of locations for development and sustainable travel patterns;</i> • <i>allowing scope for, rather than constraining, continuing development beyond 2016;</i> <p><i>whilst protecting and enhancing the historic character and setting of Cambridge and the important environmental qualities of the surrounding area.</i></p> <p><u>Phasing</u> <i>With the exception of the following, all of the above sites should be brought forward as early as possible within the Plan period.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cambridge Airport is unlikely to come forward until towards the end of the Plan period but should be treated as a priority for high density development.</i> • <i>Land between Maddingley Road and Huntingdon Road should be reserved for predominantly University-related uses and only brought forward when the University can show a clear need for the land to be released.</i> <p><i>Phasing policies will be set out in Local Plans in accordance with Policy P9/2. Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council will work together on the form and phasing of the Green Belt releases.</i></p>	

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><u>Development requirements</u> <i>Development within any of these locations will be subject to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sustainability assessments;</i> • <i>Transport assessments;</i> • <i>Securing transport improvements including those identified in Policy P9/10;</i> • <i>Securing provision of other infrastructure as required by Policy P6/1;</i> • <i>Enhancement to landscape, habitat creation and opportunities for recreation within and adjoining development areas.</i> <p><u>Masterplanning</u> <i>Strategic Masterplans will be prepared for the following locations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The southern fringe of the City as a whole – the Plan should recognise the interdependence of the Addenbrooke's and the east and south-east of Trumpington locations*. A green corridor should be retained in the vicinity of Hobson's Brook running from the Shelford area into Cambridge north of Long Road. This will be required in association with the south and west of Addenbrooke's and east and south of Trumpington locations.</i> • <i>The eastern sector including land to the North of Newmarket Road, to the North of Cherry Hinton and Cambridge Airport. Any land release in this location will need to pay proper regard to the need to maintain the penetration of the countryside into the heart of the City provided by the Teversham green finger which links with Coldhams Common.</i> <p><i>These plans should be in place before the commencement of any development in their respective areas and should include provision for early landscaping, recreation access and biodiversity improvements, including for those areas which may not be programmed for development until after 2016.</i></p> <p><i>Masterplans or Design Frameworks should be prepared for all individual sites to be released from the Green Belt. The Masterplan for West of Trumpington Road will pay particular attention to the need to protect the quality and character of Grantchester Meadows.</i></p>	

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><u><i>Safeguarding land</i></u> <i>Any land that is not required for development by 2016 will be designated as safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs.</i></p> <p>* This may also need to include the West of Trumpington Road location</p>	
New Paras.	<p>Include the following within the supporting text:</p> <p><i>‘The release for development of the Cambridge Airport location is dependent on the relocation of the Airport and associated facilities. There is a good deal of uncertainty about the precise timescale for this relocation and it is unlikely that the Airport will come forward for development until towards the end of the Plan period but it will provide scope for longer term development beyond 2016.’</i></p> <p><i>‘The Transport Assessments required in association with any development in the North West area of Cambridge will need to take into account the likely impact on transportation in the area and on the development proposals, of the CHUMMS proposals to widen the A14, the new settlement proposals and the development proposals in the Cambridge Northern Fringe.’</i></p> <p><i>‘The Strategic Masterplans are to be prepared by or for the relevant Local Planning Authority (or jointly where development straddles administrative boundaries) in conjunction with Cambridgeshire County Council. It is expected that local residents groups will be consulted as appropriate. Where Strategic Masterplans are required these should address those issues where there is an interdependency between different sites, such as concerning access, transportation, etc. Where such Masterplans have been prepared it is expected that Design Frameworks will address the detailed issues relating to the individual sites. Elsewhere, Masterplans for strategic locations such as the University land will be expected to address the relationships between the different uses within the overall site and with other existing and proposed developments in the wider locality, including the need for community facilities and services, as well as more detailed design matters. In order to avoid delays in bringing land forward for development to meet the strategy of the Plan it is expected that the masterplanning process will proceed in parallel with the preparation of the relevant Local Plans’.</i></p>	8C

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
P9/4	<p>Policy P9/4 – New Settlement</p> <p><i>A sustainable high quality settlement will be built at Longstanton/Oakington, located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington so that the development makes best use of previously developed land at Oakington Airfield and can be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway line. Provision will be made to enable development to be started on site by 2006, with a substantial contribution to housing requirements by 2010.</i></p> <p><i>The new settlement will be planned to accommodate 6,000 dwellings by 2016, with capacity ultimately for 8,000 to 10,000* dwellings in order to make a significant contribution to the longer term needs of the Sub-Region.</i></p> <p><i>The main role of the new settlement will be as a small town closely linked to Cambridge, helping to meet Sub-Regional housing needs and with high quality public transport links to Cambridge and to St Ives and Huntingdon. The new settlement will provide a well designed residential environment with social infrastructure, town centre and local facilities limited in size to cater for the needs of the settlement and the immediate surrounding area rather than the wider Sub-Region.</i></p> <p><i>There will be green separation between the new development and existing communities to maintain the village character of Longstanton and Oakington.</i></p> <p><i>Employment at the new settlement will primarily serve local needs and the needs of the Sub-Region (see Policies P2/3 and P9/8), including possible relocations from Cambridge.</i></p> <p><i>Prior to commencement of development, infrastructure requirements will be identified, their provision and timing secured in accordance with Policies P6/1 and P9/9 (Infrastructure Provision) and set out in a Masterplan approved by the Local Planning Authority in partnership with the County Council and local communities.</i></p> <p><i>Key elements will be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• High quality public transport link to main employment and other key locations in Cambridge as set out in Policy P9/10</i> <i>• Road links/road improvements as set out in Policy P9/10</i> <i>• Affordable and key worker housing</i> <i>• Secondary school and primary schools</i> 	9A

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Health facilities</i> • <i>Shopping facilities</i> • <i>Other community and social infrastructure eg library, social services and community development, police and fire</i> • <i>Recreation, including rights of way</i> • <i>An appropriate waste management facility</i> • <i>Flood control and Sustainable Drainage Systems will be required to avoid any additional risk and to mitigate current flood risks affecting Oakington village.</i> <p><i>The standard of development will be an example of excellence in the creation of a sustainable settlement (Policy P1/3) and will promote the Sub-Region as a leader in technological innovation and high quality built environment.</i></p> <p>* Review the references to the ultimate size of the new settlement here and paragraph 9.32 to clarify whether the intended capacity should be 8-10,000 dwellings or 10,000 dwellings.</p>	
	Review, in the context of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, the contribution which Cambourne might make towards meeting the development requirements of the Sub-Region through an increase in the ultimate size of the settlement to a more sustainable level.	9A
P9/5	Market Towns – Cambridge Sub-Region	
	No change	7C
P9/6	Economic Regeneration of Chatteris	
	No change	7C
9.38	Amend the supporting text to incorporate the guidance in SPA Supplement 33 specifying the trigger mechanisms to be used in connection with the release of additional housing land at Chatteris.	7C

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
P9/8	<p>Selective Management of Employment Development</p> <p><i>Employment land in and close to Cambridge will be reserved for development which can demonstrate a clear need to be located in the area in order to serve local requirements or contribute to the continuing success of the Sub-Region as a centre of high technology and research. Development proposals must demonstrate that they fall into one or more of the following categories:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) high technology and related industries and services concerned primarily with research and development, including development of D1 educational uses and associated sui generis research institutes, which can show a special need to be located close to the Universities or other established research facilities or associated services in the Cambridge area;</i> <i>b) other small-scale development in industries which would contribute to a greater range of local employment opportunities, especially where this takes advantage of, or contributes to the development of, particular locally based skills and expertise;</i> <i>c) The provision of office or other development providing an essential service for Cambridge as a local or Sub-Regional centre.</i> 	7D
New Para.	Insert the additional text set out in SPA Supplement 18 to support Policies P9/7 and P9/8, other than the reference to D1 educational uses etc, which should be included in the policy itself (see above). Make it clear in the text that pilot manufacturing forms part of research and development.	7D
9.44	Replace the first sentence with the following: <i>'Development pressures close to Cambridge are expected to remain intense so there is a need to maintain the policy of selective management of growth by discriminating in favour of uses which have an essential need for a Cambridge location. Local Planning Authorities when preparing their local plans or successor documents should define the phrase 'close to' in the context of the purpose of the policy and to the fact that selective management of employment development is not intended to apply across the whole of the Sub-Region.'</i>	7D
9.45	Relocate the cross-references to Policies P9/5, P9/6 and P2/3 contained in the last paragraph of the policy to the supporting text at paragraph 9.45.	7D
P9/9	<p>Infrastructure Provision</p> <p><i>A comprehensive approach will be adopted to secure infrastructure needed to support the development strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region. Sources of funding and land holdings will be brought together within a co-ordinated infrastructure</i></p>	3B

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><i>programme to be delivered by a partnership constituted by the local authorities and other key stakeholders. The programme will encompass:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• transport</i> <i>• affordable and key worker housing</i> <i>• education</i> <i>• health care</i> <i>• other community facilities</i> <i>• environmental improvements and provision of open space</i> <i>• waste management</i> <i>• water, flood control and drainage</i> <i>• other utilities and telecommunications.</i> <p><i>All development likely to have a definable impact on infrastructure requirements will be expected to make provision for infrastructure accommodating local impacts and also contributing to the needs of the Sub-Region as a whole. This provision is to be delivered through the joint partnership mechanism on the basis of Supplementary Planning Guidance which will set out a transparent and equitable method for the collection of contributions towards the Sub-Region infrastructure requirements. Local Plans will indicate major infrastructure requirements and any implications for the phasing of development. A commitment to the provision of associated infrastructure will be required before development is permitted.</i></p>	
9.48	Delete the second sentence and insert an up-dated position statement on the role of the Stakeholder Partnership in delivering programmes of infrastructure. Explain the process by which this will be done i.e. using Supplementary Planning Guidance.	3B
9.49	Include a reference to the indicative costs and funding of infrastructure set out in paragraph 40 of the Roger Tym study.	3B

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
P9/10	<p>Cambridge Sub-Region Transport Strategy</p> <p><i>The Transport Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is based on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The provision of a network of high quality public transport services along key transport corridors connecting Cambridge with the Market Towns, other centres and major development sites; the first phase will be a rapid transit system between Cambridge, St. Ives and Huntingdon and between the city centre and Trumpington</i> <i>• Other improvements to public transport services along key routes into the City, Market Towns and Rural Centres</i> <i>• The development of orbital routes around Cambridge to facilitate movement avoiding the city centre and connecting major development sites, employment locations and park and ride sites; priority will be given to public transport along such routes</i> <i>• Demand management measures in Cambridge City to discourage car use, reduce congestion and give priority to the efficient running of the rapid transit system and other public transport services</i> <i>• The development of more widespread facilities to encourage walking and cycling</i> <i>• Localised highway improvement schemes required to provide access to development</i> <i>• Infrastructure improvements to achieve safer travel and improved mobility for the disabled</i> <p><i>Within this strategy the transport infrastructure requirements at key development sites will be as follows:</i></p> <p><u><i>Cambridge:</i></u> <i>To support the development of the Cambridge Northern Fringe:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Chesterton rail station and interchange including link to the rapid transit system, utilising the former St Ives railway line</i> <i>• Significantly improved road, cycle and pedestrian access.</i> <p><u><i>Green Belt:</i></u> <i>To support locations subject to Green Belt review:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Local high quality improvements to walking, cycling and bus facilities will be required at all the locations listed in Policy P9/3c.</i> 	6M

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<p><i>In addition to these transport requirements the following locations will also require:</i></p> <p><i>North of Cherry Hinton:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>New access road/distributor.</i> <p><i>Cambridge Airport:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Rapid transit link to city centre as a second phase of the network described in the strategy above</i> • <i>New interchange on A14, replacing Fen Ditton interchange, linked to Airport Way</i> <p><i>South and West of Addenbrooke's Hospital and East and South East of Trumpington:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Completion of rapid transit link from Trumpington and Addenbrooke's Hospital to Cambridge</i> • <i>New station on main line at Addenbrooke's</i> <p><u><i>New Settlement at Longstanton/Oakington</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Completion of rapid transit link through the new settlement as part of Cambridge-St. Ives-Huntingdon system, with links to Trumpington and Addenbrooke's and appropriate provision of halts to serve the new settlement, and a park and ride facility;</i> • <i>Other improvements to the bus network serving Longstanton/Oakington;</i> • <i>Improved road access;</i> • <i>Cycle route alongside Cambridge to St Ives railway line;</i> • <i>On and off-line improvements to the A14, local parallel road(s) and other agreed measures proposed by the CHUMMS multi-modal study.</i> <p><u><i>Market Towns, Previously Established New Settlements and Rural Centres</i></u></p>	

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.										
	<p><i>To support development in Huntingdon, St. Neots, St. Ives, Ely, Chatteris, Cambourne and designated rural centres:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Improved bus services related to development locations</i><i>Rapid transit link from Huntingdon to Cambridge and improvements to A14 in accordance with CHUMMS proposals</i><i>Improvements on A428 corridor between Cambridge and St. Neots (A1) including development of a high quality public transport link via Cambourne</i><i>Improvements on A10 corridor between Cambridge and Ely, including development of a high quality public transport link</i><i>Local transport improvements including, where appropriate, rural interchanges, bus priority measures and other schemes to be brought forward through Market Town Strategies.</i>											
New Table	Insert a table into the supporting text, after paragraph 9.52, to show the indicative phasing of major developments in relation to the delivery of major transport infrastructure for the Cambridge Sub-Region (as in SPA Supplement 31).	5A/6M										
CHAPTER 10												
P10/1	<p>Housing Distribution – Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire</p> <p><i>Provision will be made in Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire for 22,700 additional homes between 1999-2016. The distribution of the total new housing will be approximately as follows:</i></p> <table><tr><td></td><td><i>Peterborough</i></td><td><i>Fenland</i></td><td><i>Huntingdonshire</i></td><td><i>E Cambridgeshire</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Total</i></td><td><i>12,800</i></td><td><i>6,600</i></td><td><i>2,000</i></td><td><i>1,300</i></td></tr></table> <p><i>Local Plans will identify a proportion of affordable housing of the total housing provision required in the Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire area, in accordance with Policy P5/4.</i></p> <p><i>Supplementary Planning Guidance will set out the phasing of development during the Plan period and allow for development</i></p>		<i>Peterborough</i>	<i>Fenland</i>	<i>Huntingdonshire</i>	<i>E Cambridgeshire</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>12,800</i>	<i>6,600</i>	<i>2,000</i>	<i>1,300</i>	<p>10A</p> <p>5A</p>
	<i>Peterborough</i>	<i>Fenland</i>	<i>Huntingdonshire</i>	<i>E Cambridgeshire</i>								
<i>Total</i>	<i>12,800</i>	<i>6,600</i>	<i>2,000</i>	<i>1,300</i>								

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<i>needs continuing beyond 2016. Policies in local plans will set out the more detailed phasing of housing provision.</i>	
P10/2	<p>Economic and Social Regeneration</p> <p><i>Economic and social regeneration will be concentrated in urban and rural areas where economic performance is below its potential and where social disadvantage is most pronounced.</i></p> <p><i>The priority areas for economic and social regeneration are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Inner areas of Peterborough</i> • <i>Wisbech</i> • <i>March</i> • <i>Ramsey</i> • <i>Rural areas that have EU transitional status</i> <p><i>In these areas Local Planning Authorities, working with other partners such as EEDA, the Learning Skills Council and local communities, will strongly support regeneration through:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ensuring an adequate supply of employment land and premises;</i> • <i>improving transport accessibility for all sectors of the community (see also Policy P8/6);</i> • <i>promoting the areas for inward investment;</i> • <i>protecting and enhancing their infrastructure and facilities especially in remote rural areas and particularly where infrastructure is worn out;</i> • <i>training, education and other appropriate support services;</i> • <i>investment in ICT;</i> • <i>improving the attractiveness of the areas and reducing crime.</i> 	10B

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
P10/3	<p>Market Towns – Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire</p> <p><i>Wisbech and March are identified as key Market Towns within Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire. Development will consolidate their role as the main centres of employment, services and facilities and enable them to become foci for public transport by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>enabling new employment opportunities by creating high quality business parks;</i> <i>improving links between Wisbech and March and with Peterborough;</i> <i>encouraging the dispersal of tourism/leisure opportunities from the Cambridge area (see also Policy P4/1).</i> <p><i>At Whittlesey and Ramsey proposals for new development should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>encourage appropriate small to medium scale employment opportunities;</i> <i>provide limited and small scale new housing development appropriate to their roles as a focus for the rural hinterland.</i> 	10C
P10/4	<p>Peterborough – Economic Growth</p> <p>No change</p>	10B
P10/5	<p>Peterborough – Hampton</p> <p><i>Provision for the continued development of Hampton Township will be based on a new Masterplan which will incorporate all the following principles:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>the completion of the 5,200 dwellings currently provided for and the identification of any further housing capacity (including provision for development beyond 2016) in the order of 2,000 dwellings;</i> <i>the provision of a wide range of housing types meeting the needs of all sectors of the community;</i> <i>the identification of adequate land, in terms of both quantity and quality, for employment opportunities;</i> <i>the promotion of mixed use development;</i> 	10D

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the provision of a range of facilities and services to support the community;</i> • <i>the safeguarding of areas of recreation and open space;</i> • <i>the opportunity to reduce dependency on the private car and effect a significant shift in travel modes with the focus on public transport provision;</i> • <i>the protection of the Orton Pit Special Area of Conservation.</i> 	
10.19-10.20	Add an explanation in the supporting text of the rationale for the additional 2,000 dwellings, indicating that the additional capacity is identified in order to assist in the long term planning of Hampton and will not necessarily be delivered by 2016.	10D
P10/7	<p>Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy</p> <p>We are recommending that the SPAs consider bringing together key elements of an over-arching transport strategy for the whole of the Sub-Region, followed by specific infrastructure schemes. Accordingly, we have not set out in full the text of the policy as we suggest it might appear in the Modifications. We make one specific recommendation to amend the fourth bullet point under Peterborough to read:</p> <p><i>‘support key infrastructure schemes which will enhance Peterborough’s interchange capabilities including an enhanced central railway station with excellent linkages to the bus station and appropriate car parking’.</i></p>	6N
New Table	Insert a table into the supporting text, after paragraph 10.26, to show the indicative phasing of major development in relation to the delivery of major transport infrastructure for Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire (as in SPA Supplement 31).	5A/6N
KEY DIAGRAM		
	<p>Amend the Key Diagram by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • including Chatteris as a Strategic Employment Location; • identifying Cambridge Airport on the Cambridge Inset as a strategic employment location; • replacing the term <i>‘Strategic Sites for Employment Development’</i> by <i>‘Strategic Employment Locations’</i> (also on the 	4G

Policy No.	Revised Policy	Rec No.
	Cambridge Inset) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> including the West of Trumpington Road location on the Cambridge Inset 	8C
	Incorporate into the Key Diagram the diagrammatic vision shown on SPA Supplement 7 suitably amended to delete the expanded community to the east of Cambridge Airport and to more accurately reflect the locations of the expanded communities and the green corridors.	8A
GLOSSARY		
	Delete the definition of key workers from the Glossary and replace with a definition of ‘key worker housing’ which reads: <i>‘A subset of affordable housing comprising discounted market housing targeted at specific groups, including teachers, nurses and others whose role relates to the care and comfort of the community, who are unable to meet their housing needs on the open market.’</i>	5D