

### LPC Comments

General feedback is that the document is clear and fully informative.

### **Chapter 4: Affordable Housing.**

LPC comment that caution be applied when referring to “affordable housing” as a general term, as it is known that locally the housing provided is not truly affordable to the majority of young people. Those earning NMW are unable to obtain the levels of income required to purchase or part purchase/part rent houses on the most recent developments in Cambridgeshire due to the overall property price comparisons. Consideration should be given to encouraging the building of suitable homes that are truly affordable. The term affordable housing is written as an unrealistic expectation. The NPF shows reference to the housing strategy in relation to affordable housing but at local level this is an issue still needing to be addressed.

### **Chapter 10: Transport and Highways.**

LPC comment that the document is specific to urban environments and must consider fully transport for rural environments due to the lack of available public transport and greater distances travelled to local amenities in the more rural locations.

### **Chapter 11: Education**

LPC comment on the term “school catchment capacity” – specifically at secondary school level, Linton, due to geographical location takes pupils from Essex and Suffolk. Consideration must be given to proposed development on the adjacent county boundaries to check for capacity and which also has a negative impact on traffic volumes and congestion. Any sudden influx of additional children will be extremely difficult to accommodate without additional facilities or expansion. For example, schools in Linton are not simply able to expand to accommodate extra capacity due to the location. Although the document considers Cambridgeshire as a whole, geographical pressures need to be taken into account.

### **Chapter 14: Open Spaces**

LPC comment that there is no mention of disabled access. There are no accessibility plans in the obligations and this must be addressed. It is recommended that accessibility needs to be a separate chapter in the planning obligations.

### **Chapter 19: Planning Obligations to support local employment and skills.**

LPC comment on employment and skills, raise an issue with the statement that all apprentices should be paid NLW as it is believed to be contrary to employment law and not a planning obligation. If apprentices are paid at least the real living wage this would potentially deter employers from recruiting at this level.

### **Chapter 22: Healthcare**

LPC comment that there is no mention of provision for dentistry and request this be included as essential to healthcare.

**General Comments:**

LPC request that consideration be given to the transparency of the pre-application advice given to developers in the event of an application is submitted and that the advice given should always be publicly available for transparency. LPC request that consideration be given for all parishes to be fully involved in the process of setting planning obligations. The public consultation questionnaires provided by developers for large developments must be scrutinised by the planning authority as these are known to invite answers that suggest approval at local level. It is felt, at parish level that it is only once an application has been made that submitted objections are considered. Discussions at district level should include the statutory consultees as decisions need account for and have clear understanding of the impact in the parish and to take into account concerns/suggestions at the most local level.