# Greater Cambridge Local Plan – The First Proposals

# Form to assist in drafting responses to the consultation

This form is provided to help you develop your comments in response to the detailed policies in the First Proposals.

When you are ready to submit, please input your comments into our online consultation system – this ensures that the right comments are assigned to the right policy, and that we can track and respond to them appropriately. Please do not return this form to us by email or post, as our team will have to manually enter your responses into the online system and this has scope for error or misinterpretation of your comments.

If you have difficulty commenting online, please contact us at localplan@greatercambridgeplanning.org or 01954 713694. We are holding a webinar on the comment process on 4 November 2021 which you may attend or watch back – visit [www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/localplan](http://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/localplan) for joining details.

### What to comment on:

* Please let us know what you support in the proposals, as well as what you do not support – it is important to know what you support, and why, so that we know what parts of the proposals are felt to be broadly sound.
* You do not need to comment on each section and policy – only comment on aspects of the plan which you feel strongly about.
* Please keep your comments concise and specific. We receive thousands of comments and it helps us to identify the most important points you raise if they are clearly worded.
* Please do not include personally or commercially sensitive information in your comments. We will redact any such information, as well as any offensive material, prior to publishing comments.
* You can upload attachments, but please avoid uploading lengthy documents or general reports or articles. We cannot take into account any material which is not specific to Greater Cambridge or the Local Plan.

## Vision and development strategy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section / Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Vision and aims |  |
| How much development, and where – general comments | *“Alongside this, we want our new towns to mature into great places to live and work, making the most of their existing and planned public transport links to Cambridge and other centres. In the case of Cambourne, East-West Rail means that it will be one of the best-connected places in our region, and whilst things like the location of the new station are yet to be resolved, we do think it can develop into a more substantial town with a more fully developed and lively centre.”** This does not apply only to new towns. Other scales of settlements will be extremely well connected also, e.g. Papworth Everard.
* Papworth Everard is currently a minor rural centre but one that is highly sustainable and has real growth potential. It too could grow, in a sensitive manner, to provide new services and support and improve existing services, helping to make it a vibrant and attractive place to live.

*“We want our rural villages to continue to thrive and sustain their local services, but we don’t want to encourage lots of new homes in places where car travel is the easiest or only way to get around. We therefore propose some development in and around larger villages that have good transport links and services, and to support important employment clusters. In smaller villages, we’ll continue to support infill development and affordable housing on suitable sites, but we do not propose lots of village growth.”** Given all of the transport improvements planned for the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor, and connecting directly to Papworth Everard, there will be a multitude of transport options available for residents from early in the plan period. Car travel will not therefore be the easiest or only option for getting around.
* Papworth Everard stands out from the other minor rural centres and villages in the plan as what will be one of the best connected villages, if not the best connected village, in the plan area. Unlike many other villages in the plan, therefore, it is a logical location for growth. The southern side of the settlement is the obvious location for such growth in view of its proximity and connection to the various forthcoming new transport and transport upgrade schemes.
* Land at Crow's Nest Farm, Papworth Everard (Greater Cambridge HELAA (2021) Site Reference: 48096) would have excellent transport links and could provide a Rural Travel Hub to optimise and maximise the use of those links, making sustainable travel modes easier and more attractive than car travel for those living at the site, and residents of Papworth Everard more generally.

**"Housing Delivery Study – FINAL VERSION Prepared for: Greater Cambridge Shared Planning AECOM**…11.19 It is still the case that generally the spatial options that mix short-medium term sources of supply (smaller sites in urban areas and villages) with longer-term sources (new settlements, urban extensions and Green Belt release) are better-able to deliver across the plan period as a whole with a smoother trajectory. These sites also have different characteristics and are likely to result in variety in terms of location, size, type and tenure of housing, and also be more geographically spread to reduce competition, thus better-matching the housing supply with demand.”“11.20 The housing delivery assumptions in this report still show that in order to optimise housing delivery, demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and maintain delivery across the plan period, it will be necessary to gap-fill the ‘troughs’ in the housing trajectory with additional sources of supply. This should be underpinned by cautious but realistic lead-in times and build-out rates, and an ‘over-allocation’ of land against the eventual housing requirement (we recommend at least a 10% buffer) in order to ensure that any unforeseen delays to delivering individual site allocations during the plan period, or changes to market conditions, do not result in under-delivery that would threaten the five year housing land supply or performance against the Housing Delivery Test.”* The ’additional sources of supply’ which the Housing Delivery Study says will be necessary for gap-filling are not included in the ‘First Proposals’.
* The Councils have included an ‘over-allocation buffer’ of 10% but, as the Study implies, this simply underpins the gap-filling (by building in flexibility and resilience to the supply), but does not constitute gap-filling itself.
* What is needed for effective gap-filling is the short-medium term sources of supply that paragraph 11.19 refers to (smaller sites in urban areas and villages), like Land at Crow's Nest Farm, Papworth Everard (Greater Cambridge HELAA (2021) Site Reference: 48096).
* As paragraph 11.19 points out, spatial options that combine such sites with longer-term sources are better able to deliver across the plan period as a whole with a smoother trajectory.
* It is also the case that these short-medium term sources will provide greater variety in terms of location, size, type and tenure of housing and will, as stated in paragraph 11.19, “[better-match] the housing supply with demand”. These are essential matters in themselves but are of even greater import when coupled with their ability to gap-fill the housing supply ‘troughs’.
* **Land at Crow's Nest Farm, Papworth Everard (Greater Cambridge HELAA (2021) Site Reference: 48096) and other small-medium sites that are well located in relation to public transport corridors and nodes should therefore be allocated in order to:**
1. **Provide a reliable, smooth supply of housing land over the whole plan period; and**
2. **Provide as much choice as possible in terms of the location, size, type and tenure of housing that the plan can offer.**
 |
| *S/JH: New jobs and homes* | *“We propose that the new Local Plan will meet the following objectively assessed needs for development in the period 2020-2041:** *58,500 jobs*
* *44,400 homes, reflecting an annual objectively assessed need of 2,111 homes per year, which is rounded for the plan.”*
* Despite being significant, the level of growth proposed is insufficient.
* Through their ongoing extensive and detailed research, Cambridge Ahead (likely the foremost authority on the mater of Cambridge’s economy and growth), have concluded/demonstrated as follows with respect to the ‘First Proposals’:
	+ If planned for well, higher growth rates than those proposed can be accommodated in a way that improves quality of life for existing and new residents in balance with the needs of the environment and the economy (i.e. in a sustainable way).
	+ The most recent growth data does not support the projections expressed in the ‘First Proposals’. This raises concerns that the Councils will again serially underestimate the opportunities that high growth creates.
	+ **Cambridge Ahead’s view is that the long run rates in the ‘First Proposals’ are adopting an under-estimate and do not provide the best possible objective assessment of the area’s growth.** As a result, the **‘**First Proposals’ risk repeating the previous errors in the EEFM forecasts and ignoring the warnings flagged by the Cambridge Ahead’s CPIER.
	+ The three complementary arguments underlying the recommended annualised growth scenarios for the emerging Plan – KS3/1.1%, with the possibility of the slightly higher KS2/1.5% - have clear flaws, as set out in GL Hearn’s analysis. The historical reversion to the regional mean was notably higher than the recommended figure. The reasons put forward for discounting the recent performance of the higher exogenous sectors have not provided supporting evidence and therefore lack a credible evidential basis. In addition, the suggestion that the high growth between 2011-17 was peaking and is likely to regress to a future regional or national mean has not only been unconvincingly argued, but has now been convincingly rebutted by the continued high growth of the region.
	+ Accordingly, Cambridge Ahead do not feel that the recommended Plan annualised growth rates stand up to the test of providing an objective assessment for the region’s proposed future growth.
* Having regard to Cambridge Ahead’s findings therefore, higher rates of growth not just can be provided for (because they can be delivered sustainably) but should be provided for (in order that the levels of growth that current trends show are most likely to occur over the plan period are catered for).
* **The growth in jobs and homes proposed in the ‘First Proposals’ and subsequent drafts of the emerging local plan should therefore be increased to the higher jobs and homes scenario (the ‘Maximum continue existing patterns’ scenario - 78,000 jobs and 53,500 homes).**

*“What alternatives did we consider?**1. Planning for the higher jobs forecast and level of homes associated with it. This alternative was rejected as this higher jobs forecast could be possible, but is not the most likely future scenario. As such we do not consider that it represents our objectively assessed need, and would therefore not be a reasonable alternative.”** **In view of the foregoing, the higher jobs forecast, and therefore the need for the higher level of homes associated with it (the ‘Maximum continue existing patterns’ scenario - 78,000 jobs and 53,500 homes), is not just possible but is what the evidence suggests is actually the most likely future scenario. Accordingly, this scenario is likely to represent the objectively assessed need for jobs and housing in Greater Cambridge and should be adopted by the ‘First Proposals’ and subsequent drafts of the emerging plan for this reason.**
 |
| *S/DS: Development strategy* | *“The proposed development strategy takes up opportunities to use brownfield land and responds to opportunities created by proposed major new infrastructure.”** The proposed development strategy does not respond sufficiently and most effectively to the opportunity created by the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor.
* The strategy only makes one allocation within the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor (at Cambourne).
* This does not capitalise fully on the opportunity because:
	+ Further growth could be delivered along the corridor in a sustainable manner; and
	+ To be reliable, any growth delivered within the corridor should be delivered in more than just one location in order to provide:
		- Greater choice in terms of the location, size, type and tenure of housing that the emerging local plan can offer.
		- Greater flexibility and resilience in this arm of the emerging local plan’s housing/development strategy.

*“For our new settlements, we propose:** *Evolving and expanding Cambourne into a vibrant town alongside the development of the new station, which will make it one of the best connected and most accessible places in the area; and …”*
* Like Cambourne, Papworth Everard will be one of the best connected and most accessible places in the area.
* It too should be allowed to evolve and expand in a proportionate and sustainable manner.
* Land at Crow's Nest Farm, Papworth Everard (Greater Cambridge HELAA (2021) Site Reference: 48096) could accommodate such, as demonstrated in the updated vision document for the site (December 2021 – submitted through the ‘Submit additional site information’ part of the ‘First Proposals’ consultation).

*“We propose some development in the rural area south of Cambridge, the Rural Southern Cluster, where homes and jobs can be located close to each other and served by good quality public transport, cycling and walking links, including:** *Employment and tied housing at the Wellcome Genome Campus expansion – confirming the existing planning permission;*
* *Additional employment at Babraham Research Campus, through releasing the Campus and a modest area of additional land from the Green Belt;*
* *New smaller sites for housing and employment in villages that have very good public transport access and are close to jobs, some of which are through release of land from the Green Belt; and …”*
* It is not clear why the cluster approach has been adopted only in the southern rural area of Greater Cambridge and not other rural parts of plan area.
* The rural southern area is not the only area which lends itself to such an approach. Another obvious location for the adopting the cluster approach to allocating new development is the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor. Significant employment exists in both Cambourne and Papworth Everard already and there is clear logic in allocating new employment and housing to support it.
* Both Cambourne and Papworth Everard have very good public transport links (one of the key criteria applied in the Rural Southern Cluster allocation approach).
* Accordingly, growth should be allocated to Papworth Everard in the same manner as it is proposed to be allocated to villages in the Rural Southern Cluster in order to:
	+ support and grow the existing employment provision in the area;
	+ help meet the plan’s housing requirement (which should be based on the ‘Maximum continue existing patterns’ scenario - 78,000 jobs and 53,500 homes);
	+ provide greater choice in terms of the location, size, type and tenure of housing that the plan can offer; and
	+ provide greater flexibility and resilience in the Councils’ housing/development strategy.

*“In the rest of the rural area, we propose a very limited amount of development:** *Small new sites for housing and employment at villages that have very good public transport access, to help our rural communities thrive; …”*
* The proposed development strategy involves growth in only a very limited selection of the settlements in Greater Cambridge.
* Papworth Everard will have excellent public transport access following the delivery of several committed transport infrastructure projects. It is therefore a settlement where housing and employment growth should be being allocated in order to:
	+ Help the village thrive;
	+ Support the local economy;
	+ Help meet the plan’s housing requirement;
	+ Provide greater choice in terms of the location, size, type and tenure of housing that the plan can offer; and
	+ Provide greater flexibility and resilience in the Councils’ housing/development strategy.

*“In order to provide greater confidence that the identified housing needs in Policy S/JH New Jobs and Homes can be met, and that a continuing supply of housing can be demonstrated, we are proposing to allocate enough sites to provide approximately a 10% buffer so we have the flexibility to deal with unforeseen circumstances. We also propose to provide flexibility in the amount and type of employment land supply to help enable the Greater Cambridge economy to continue to flourish.”** The ‘additional sources of supply’ which the Housing Delivery Study says will be necessary for gap-filling are not included in the ‘First Proposals’.
* The Councils have included an ‘over-allocation buffer’ of 10% but, as the Study implies, this simply underpins the gap-filling (by building in flexibility and resilience to the supply), but does not constitute gap-filling itself.
* What is needed for effective gap-filling is the short-medium term sources of supply that paragraph 11.19 of the Housing Delivery Study refers to (smaller sites in urban areas and villages), like Land at Crow's Nest Farm, Papworth Everard (Greater Cambridge HELAA (2021) Site Reference: 48096).
* As paragraph 11.19 points out, spatial options that combine such sites with longer-term sources are better able to deliver across the plan period, and with a smoother trajectory.
* It is also the case that these short-medium term sources will provide greater variety in terms of location, size, type and tenure of housing and will, as stated in paragraph 11.19, “[better-match] the housing supply with demand”. These are essential matters in themselves but are of even greater import when coupled with their ability to gap-fill the housing supply ‘troughs’.
* Land at Crow's Nest Farm, Papworth Everard (Greater Cambridge HELAA (2021) Site Reference: 48096) and other small-medium sites that are well located in relation to public transport corridors and nodes should therefore be allocated in order to:
	+ Provide a reliable, smooth supply of housing land over the whole plan period; and
	+ Provide as much choice as possible in terms of the location, size, type and tenure of housing that the plan can offer.

*“The total additional homes to be identified is set out below, taking into account the identified housing need for the period 2020-41, application of the approximate 10% buffer, and current committed housing supply.”*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Homes to provide for*** | *Homes 2020‑2041* |
| *Housing need (rounded)* | *44,400* |
| *Approximate 10% buffer for flexibility* | *4,440* |
| *Total number of homes to provide for* | *48,840* |
| ***Current housing supply:****comprising**adopted allocations, windfall allowance, and dwelling equivalent from communal accommodation allocated or with planning permission* | *37,200* |
| ***Total additional homes to be identified*** | ***11,640*** |

*The sources of housing supply to meet the requirement set out above include the following sites (note some sites will continue to build out beyond 2041 – see individual site sections):** Despite being significant, the level of growth proposed is insufficient.
* Through their ongoing extensive and detailed research, Cambridge Ahead (likely the foremost authority on the mater of Cambridge’s economy and growth), have concluded/demonstrated as follows with respect to the ‘First Proposals’:
	+ If planned for well, higher growth rates than those proposed can be accommodated in a way that improves quality of life for existing and new residents in balance with the needs of the environment and the economy (i.e. in a sustainable way).
	+ The most recent growth data does not support the projections expressed in the ‘First Proposals’. This raises concerns that the Councils will again serially underestimate the opportunities that high growth creates.
	+ **Cambridge Ahead’s view is that the long run rates in the ‘First Proposals’ are adopting an under-estimate and do not provide the best possible objective assessment of the area’s growth.** As a result, the **‘**First Proposals’ risk repeating the previous errors in the EEFM forecasts and ignoring the warnings flagged by the Cambridge Ahead’s CPIER.
	+ The three complementary arguments underlying the recommended annualised growth scenarios for the emerging Plan – KS3/1.1%, with the possibility of the slightly higher KS2/1.5% - have clear flaws, as set out in GL Hearn’s analysis. The historical reversion to the regional mean was notably higher than the recommended figure. The reasons put forward for discounting the recent performance of the higher exogenous sectors have not provided supporting evidence and therefore lack a credible evidential basis. In addition, the suggestion that the high growth between 2011-17 was peaking and is likely to regress to a future regional or national mean has not only been unconvincingly argued, but has now been convincingly rebutted by the continued high growth of the region.
	+ Accordingly, Cambridge Ahead do not feel that the recommended Plan annualised growth rates stand up to the test of providing an objective assessment for the region’s proposed future growth.
* Having regard to Cambridge Ahead’s findings therefore, higher rates of growth not just can be provided for (because they can be delivered sustainably) but should be provided for (in order that the levels of growth that current trends show are most likely to occur over the plan period are catered for).
* **The growth in jobs and homes proposed in the ‘First Proposals’ and subsequent drafts of the emerging local plan should therefore be increased to the higher jobs and homes scenario (the ‘Maximum continue existing patterns’ scenario - 78,000 jobs and 53,500 homes).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Location*** | ***Policy reference / Site name*** | ***Homes 2020‑2041*** |
| *New settlements* | *S/CB Cambourne* | *1,950* |

* New housing along the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor should not be allocated to Cambourne alone.
* Papworth Everard provides an excellent location for new housing and relates equally well to the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor.
* Allocating land at Papworth Everard for housing would provide:
	+ Greater choice in terms of the location, size, type and tenure of housing that the plan can offer.
	+ Greater flexibility and resilience in this aspect of the Councils’ housing/development strategy.

*What alternatives did we consider?**“… Our evidence showed that these performed well against our core evidence and better than most other alternative options when considered against key aims of:** *Reducing climate impacts through compact development located to connect homes and jobs, and where active and sustainable travel can be maximised;*
* *Making best use of suitable safeguarded and brownfield land;*
* *Making best use of existing and committed key sustainable transport infrastructure; and*
* *Supporting rural communities to thrive and sustain services.”*

*“Consideration was given to the provision of a range of sizes and types of sites to give flexibility and help with delivery over the plan period, reflecting our evidence, and a modest element of housing was in principle considered to be an appropriate element of the strategy. Drawing on our evidence, a wide range of sites were considered but many were not preferred due to their impacts, with only a limited number of sites being preferred in Cambridge, close to centres of employment in the southern cluster, and in villages well served by public transport in the rest of the rural area. Allocating large numbers of sites in villages was not a preferred approach, as evidence demonstrated how poorly dispersed strategy performed with regard to a number of issues, but particularly in relation to transport and carbon impacts.”** Despite what is claimed, the development strategy which has been selected does not perform well against the key aims of:
	+ Making best use of existing and committed key sustainable transport infrastructure; and
	+ Supporting rural communities to thrive and sustain services.

This is because:* it does not capitalise fully and most effectively on the committed key sustainable transport infrastructure along the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor.
* It involves and therefore supports very few rural communities and, therefore, far from thriving, most rural communities will stand still or stagnate during the plan period, rather than growing in a sustainable manner.
* Further, the development strategy is insufficiently diversified because:
* It does not include enough small-medium size allocations to:
	+ Provide a reliable, smooth supply of housing land over the whole plan period; and
	+ Provide a suitable level of choice in terms of the location, size, type and tenure of housing that the emerging local plan will deliver.
* As a result the development strategy risks:
* further concentrating growth and wealth in a limited number of areas within Greater Cambridge.
* Not sufficiently capitalising on the significant opportunity offered by the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor.
* Failing to support the successful delivery of the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor as a result of not allocating development which will help fund, support and connect with it.
 |
| S/SH: Settlement hierarchy |  |
| S/SB: Settlement boundaries |  |

## Cambridge urban area

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Cambridge urban area - general comments |  |
| S/NEC: North East Cambridge |  |
| S/AMC: Areas of Major Change |  |
| S/OA: Opportunity Areas in Cambridge |  |
| S/LAC: Land allocations in Cambridge |  |

## Edge of Cambridge

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Edge of Cambridge - general comments |  |
| S/CE: Cambridge East |  |
| S/NWC: North West Cambridge |  |
| S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus |  |
| S/WC: West Cambridge |  |
| S/EOC: Other existing allocations on the edge of Cambridge |  |

## New settlements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| New settlements - general comments |  |
| S/CB: Cambourne | * Figure 7.1 (Combined Broad Opportunities Map) of the Greater Cambridge Green Infrastructure Opportunity Mapping Baseline Report (November 2020) shows proposed allocation S/CB: Cambourne as lying within five green infrastructure theme areas. Papworth Everard, however, is shown to fall within only three green infrastructure areas. In terms of environmental impact therefore, this makes Papworth Everard one of the lowest impact locations for development along the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor within Greater Cambridge. As a result, in addition to the following reasons, new housing and employment allocations should be made at Papworth Everard.

Other reasons:* To meet the housing requirement for the ‘First Proposals’ and subsequent drafts of the emerging local plan, which should be increased to the higher jobs and homes scenario (the ‘Maximum continue existing patterns’ scenario - 78,000 jobs and 53,500 homes);
* To provide greater choice in terms of the location, size, type and tenure of housing that the plan can offer;
* To provide greater flexibility and resilience in the Councils’ housing/development strategy;
* To support rural communities (like Papworth Everard) and help them to thrive; and
* To support the successful delivery of the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor through allocating development in locations that will help fund, support and connect with it.
* Further, given its location on the southern side of Papworth Everard (the obvious location for allocations in view of the proximity and connection to the various forthcoming new transport and transport upgrade schemes), Land at Crow's Nest Farm, Papworth Everard, (Greater Cambridge HELAA (2021) Site Reference: 48096) would be ideally suited to accommodate this growth.
 |
| S/NS: Existing new settlements |  |

## Rural southern cluster

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Rural southern cluster - general comments |  |
| S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton |  |
| S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus |  |
| S/RSC: Village allocations in the rural southern cluster |  |
| S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster |  |

## Rest of the rural area

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Rest of the rural area - general comments |  |
| S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area | * The proposed development strategy involves growth in only a very limited selection of the settlements in Greater Cambridge.
* Papworth Everard will have excellent public transport accessibility following the delivery of several committed transport infrastructure projects. It is therefore a settlement where housing and employment growth should be being allocated in order to:
	+ Help the village thrive;
	+ Support the local economy;
	+ Help meet the emerging local plan’s housing requirement, which should be increased to the higher jobs and homes scenario (the ‘Maximum continue existing patterns’ scenario - 78,000 jobs and 53,500 homes);
	+ Provide greater choice in terms of the location, size, type and tenure of housing that the plan can offer; and
	+ Provide greater flexibility and resilience in the Councils’ housing/development strategy.
 |
| S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area |  |

## Climate change

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Climate change - general comments |  |
| CC/NZ: Net zero carbon new buildings |  |
| CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments |  |
| CC/DC: Designing for a changing climate |  |
| CC/FM: Flooding and integrated water management |  |
| CC/RE: Renewable energy projects and infrastructure |  |
| CC/CE: Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy |  |
| CC/CS: Supporting land based carbon sequestration |  |

## Biodiversity and green spaces

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Biodiversity and green spaces - general comments |  |
| BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity |  |
| BG/GI: Green infrastructure  |  |
| BG/TC: Improving Tree canopy cover and the tree population |  |
| BG/RC: River corridors |  |
| BG/PO: Protecting open spaces |  |
| BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces |  |

## Wellbeing and inclusion

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Wellbeing and inclusion - general comments |  |
| WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments |  |
| WS/CF: Community, sports, and leisure facilities |  |
| WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments |  |
| WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments |  |
| WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety |  |

## Great places policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Great places – general comments |  |
| GP/PP: People and place responsive design |  |
| GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character |  |
| GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt |  |
| GP/QD: Achieving high quality development |  |
| GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm |  |
| GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets |  |
| GP/CC: Adapting heritage assets to climate change |  |
| GP/PH8: Protection of Public Houses |  |

## Jobs policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Jobs – general comments |  |
| J/NE: New employment development proposals |  |
| J/RE: Supporting the rural Economy |  |
| J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land |  |
| J/PB: Protecting existing business space |  |
| J/RW: Enabling remote working |  |
| J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries |  |
| J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks |  |
| J/RC: Retail and centres |  |
| J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities |  |
| J/FD: Faculty development and specialist / language schools |  |

## Homes policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Homes – general comments |  |
| H/AH: Affordable housing |  |
| H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing |  |
| H/HM: Housing mix |  |
| H/HD: Housing density |  |
| H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots |  |
| H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes |  |
| H/SH: Specialist housing and homes for older people |  |
| H/CB: Self- and custom-build homes |  |
| H/BR: Build to rent homes |  |
| H/MO: Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) |  |
| H/SA: Student accommodation |  |
| H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside |  |
| H/RM: Residential moorings |  |
| H/RC: Residential caravans |  |
| H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Show People sites |  |
| H/CH: Community led housing |  |

## Infrastructure policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Infrastructure – general comments |  |
| I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity |  |
| I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles |  |
| I/FD: Freight and delivery consolidation |  |
| I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure |  |
| I/AD: Aviation development |  |
| I/EI: Energy infrastructure masterplanning |  |
| I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery |  |
| I/DI: Digital infrastructure |  |

## Supporting documents on which we are consulting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment) |  |
| Habitats Regulations Assessment |  |

If you wish to comment on other evidence base documents, please assign your comments to the policy which the evidence document supports. For example, if you wish to comment on rejected sites within the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment, please comment against the allocations policy for the area in which the site is located (for example Cambridge urban area or rural southern cluster). If you wish to comment on the Green Belt study, please comment against the Green Belt policy.