



# **Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document**

**Statement of Consultation – post consultation stage**

**August 2025**

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	4
2. Background .....	4
3. Preparation of the draft Supplementary Planning Document.....	4
4. Public consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document .....	5
5. Consultation Methodology .....	6
6. Representations received.....	7
7. Summary of main issues raised during consultation and how they have been addressed .....	9
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	9, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20
Chapter 2: Approach to Planning Obligations .....	14, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25
Chapter 3: How to use this Supplementary Planning Document .....	19, 26
Chapter 4: Affordable Housing.....	20, 27, 28, 29
Chapter 5: Green Infrastructure .....	23, 30, 31, 32
Chapter 6: Biodiversity.....	26, 33, 34
Chapter 7: Community Facilities .....	28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40
Chapter 8: Social and Community Support Services .....	34, 41
Chapter 9: Social and Community Support Services .....	35, 42, 43
Chapter 10: Transport and Highways .....	38, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48
Chapter 11: Education .....	43, 49, 50
Chapter 12: Public Art.....	45, 51, 52, 53, 54
Chapter 13: Burial Space.....	48, 55, 56, 57, 58
Chapter 14: Public Open Space .....	53, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63
Chapter 15: Indoor Sports, including Swimming .....	57, 64, 65, 66, 67
Chapter 16: Public Realm.....	61, 68
Chapter 17: Waste and Recycling .....	62, 69
Chapter 18: Emergency Services .....	64, 70, 71, 72
Chapter 19: Planning Obligations to Support Local Employment and Skills ...	67, 73
Chapter 20: Planning Obligations to Support Affordable Workspace ..	69, 75, 76, 77
Chapter 21: Public Rights of Way .....	71, 78
Chapter 22: Healthcare.....	73, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86
Chapter 23: Other Potential Development Specific Requirements .....	81, 87
Appendix A: Children and Occupancy Yield.....	82
Appendix B: Schedule of Inputs Required for Viability Appraisal .....	83
Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA): Draft Planning Obligations SPD .....	83
Sustainability Appraisal Screening Report: Draft Planning Obligations SPD .....	83

Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report: Draft Planning Obligations SPD .....	84
Consultation Statement: Draft Planning Obligations SPD.....	84
Appendix A: List of organisations consulted .....	85

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires a local planning authority to consult the public and stakeholders before adopting a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Regulation 12(a) requires a Statement to be prepared setting out who has been consulted while preparing the SPD; a summary of the main issues raised; and how these issues have been addressed in the final SPD. Regulation 12(b) requires that Statement to also be published as part of the formal consultation on the SPD.
- 1.2 In the case of this SPD, it was determined that following the consultation that was held in November 2024 to January 2025 a further public consultation would be held in summer 2025 on a revised version of the SPD prior to considering adoption.
- 1.3 This statement is an update on the previous consultation statement by providing further detail on how comments have been addressed and reflected in this revision of the SPD.

## 2. Background

- 2.1 The Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD has been prepared to assist with the implementation of policies within the adopted Local Plans covering the Greater Cambridge area, namely the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (September 2018) and the Cambridge Local Plan (October 2018). It will supplement Policy 85: Infrastructure delivery, planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and Policy TI/8: Infrastructure and New Developments of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, alongside other policies within the adopted development plans that seek to mitigate the impact new development can have on the environment and existing infrastructure. Once adopted, This SPD will supersede the [Cambridge City Council Planning Obligations strategy SPD 2010](#).
- 2.2 The SPD is structured in 23 chapters and two appendices.

## 3. Preparation of the draft Supplementary Planning Document

- 3.1 In preparing this draft version of the SPD, a further informal consultation was carried out with a range of internal officers within Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire District Councils, and with Cambridgeshire County Council. Several calls were held with officers to discuss representations received during the consultation and to confirm proposed modifications in this version of the SPD. Officers also provided further comments regarding improving clarity in certain sections and minor editorial amendments.

## 4. Public consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document

- 4.1 The previous draft SPD was approved for public consultation on Monday 4 November 2024 at Cambridge City Council Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee and on Tuesday 5 November 2024 at South Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet meeting.
- 4.2 A consultation on the previous draft of the SPD took place for eight weeks from 9am on Thursday 28 November 2024 and ran until 5pm on Friday 24 January 2025. The consultation approach reflected the requirements of national regulations and the [Greater Cambridge Statement of Community Involvement](#) (2024).
- 4.3 During the consultation period, the draft SPD and associated supported documents were available to view on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website at: <https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/emerging-plans-and-guidance/supplementary-planning-documents/> The associated supporting documents made available to view with the draft SPD were:
- Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document Equality Impact Assessment
  - Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report
  - Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report
  - Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Statement.
- 4.4 A range of specific and general consultation bodies and other relevant stakeholders were directly notified via email of the consultation arrangements for the draft SPD. A list of the organisations notified is attached at Appendix A. In summary the organisations and bodies contacted included, but were not limited to (as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement):
- Local Parish Councils
  - Local Members
  - Specific Consultation Bodies
  - Cambridgeshire County Council
  - Greater Cambridge Partnership
  - Adjacent Local Authorities
  - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
  - Delivery partners, including infrastructure and transport providers
  - Community organisations
  - General Consultation Bodies, including groups which represent the interests of different diversity groups.

4.5 In addition to statutory consultees and organisations, individuals who have expressed a wish to be kept informed of Planning Policy consultations via the Greater Cambridge Planning Service Consultation database were invited to comment on the consultation via email, or by post where no email address was available.

4.6 To engage more widely with the local community, businesses and stakeholders in the Greater Cambridge area, a range of methods of notification used were:

- The draft SPD and associated supporting documents were available to view on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning [website](#)
- Posts on social media platforms including [Facebook](#), [X](#) and [LinkedIn](#)
- A public notice was published in the Cambridge Independent newspaper and on the [Public Notice Portal website](#) on 27 November 2024.
- An [article](#) was published in the Cambridge City Council's magazine for residents 'Cambridge Matters' in the Winter 2024 edition.

4.7 GCSP held in-person and online consultation events during the consultation period. The [online webinar](#) about all three of the draft SPDs that were being consulted on during the consultation period was held on Tuesday 10 December 2024 and the recording can be viewed on YouTube.

4.8 Following on from the first draft of the Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD that went out to consultation between November 2024 to January 2025. The results of the consultation were taken to [South Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet meeting](#) and the [Cambridge City Council Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee meeting](#) in March 2025. It was agreed at both meetings that subject to the draft Planning Obligations SPD providing additional evidence and a decision being made by the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure in consultation with Chair and Spokes on the revisions made to the SPD, that it could then proceed to an additional round of public consultation in summer 2025.

## 5. Consultation Methodology

5.1 The consultation on the previous draft of the SPD took place for eight weeks from 9am on Thursday 28 November 2024 and ran until 5pm on Friday 24 January 2025.

5.2 The draft SPD and associated supporting documents were available to view on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning [website](#) and comments could be

submitted online, by email or by post. Respondents could also request a form to complete.

5.3 The draft SPD and supporting documents were also made available to view at the following locations:

- Cambridge City Council's Customer Service Centre (Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY) between 9am and 5.15pm Wednesday to Friday
- Cambridge Central Library (7 Lion Yard Cambridge CB2 3QD) during normal opening hours
- South Cambridgeshire District Council Reception: South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge, CB23 6EA ([by appointment only](#)).

5.4 Comments on the draft SPD could be submitted as part of the consultation by:

- Online on our [consultation system hub](#)
- By email at [localplan@greatercambridgeplanning.org](mailto:localplan@greatercambridgeplanning.org)
- By post: Planning Policy, Cambridge City Council, PO Box 700, Cambridge, CB1 0JH
- Or by requesting a form to complete and return to us by email or post.

5.5 A contact email address, telephone number and address for the Planning Policy Team were included on all publicity materials allowing those experiencing difficulties accessing the documents online to seek assistance. Officers were able to facilitate alternative methods for viewing the documents and for comments to be submitted including via email or post.

5.6 Alternative formats of the consultation documents were made available upon request (such as braille, translations into other languages and large print).

5.7 Respondents were able to request to be notified of the adoption of the SPD.

## **6. Representations received**

6.1 During the consultation, a total of 198 representations were received from 37 separate individuals or organisations who responded to the consultation.

6.2 Of the representations received, 1 was in support, 26 were objections, and 171 were comments seeking amendments to the SPD. The number of comments received for each chapter of the SPD are set out in Table 1 below.

6.3 All of the representations are available to be read in full on our online consultation system at: [Greater Cambridge Shared Planning - Draft Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document Consultation](#).

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Number of representations received</b>
Introduction	17
Chapter 2: Approach to Planning Obligations	11
Chapter 3: How to use this Supplementary Planning Document	2
Chapter 4: Affordable Housing	8
Chapter 5: Green Infrastructure	7
Chapter 6: Biodiversity	5
Chapter 7: Community Facilities	11
Chapter 8: Social and Community Support Services	3
Chapter 9: Libraries and Lifelong Learning	7
Chapter 10: Transport and Highways	13
Chapter 11: Education	6
Chapter 12: Public Art	8
Chapter 13: Burial Space	9
Chapter 14: Public Open Space	11
Chapter 15: Indoor Sports, including Swimming	11
Chapter 16: Public Realm	3
Chapter 17: Waste and Recycling	3
Chapter 18: Emergency Services	11
Chapter 19: Planning Obligations to support local employment and skills	6
Chapter 20: Planning Obligations to support affordable workspace	7
Chapter 21: Public Rights of Way	4
Chapter 22: Healthcare	24
Chapter 23: Other Potential Development Specific Requirements	5
Appendix A: Children and Occupancy Yields	2
Appendix B: Schedule of Inputs Required for Viability Appraisal	0
Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA): Draft Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD	0
Sustainability Appraisal Screening Report: Draft Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD	1
Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report: Draft Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD	1
Consultation Statement: Draft Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD	2

6.4 The representations received to the consultation were considered after the consultation ended. These are set out in the following section under each chapter heading of the SPD along with the Councils assessment and initial response to the comments. In a number of cases issues are highlighted



which will be considered and addressed through a revised draft of the SPD which is still to be developed. Once prepared this will then be subject to a further stage of public consultation in summer 2025. Representations to that will be considered and a further additional statement of consultation prepared prior to considering the document for adoption.

## **7. Summary of main issues raised during consultation and how they have been addressed**

### **Chapter 1: Introduction**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 17

#### **Representation 200155 (Mr Mark Colville)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

Whilst the need for more housing, and therefore to streamline planning applications, is understood, it is important to ensure that standards and level of scrutiny are not inappropriately reduced. Shoe-horning additional houses onto the fringes of existing villages, particularly where this involves developing green belt land, creating access and wider transport issues or increasing flood risk to existing properties does not.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. However, it is not the role and function of the Planning Obligations SPD to determine where development and growth should be allowed for, rather that is the role of the Local Plan. The Planning Obligations SPD is concerned with ensuring development complies with the requirements of Local Plan policies and that unacceptable impacts are appropriately managed and/or mitigated.

#### **Representation 200225 (CUH, NHS Foundation Trust)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

We ask that the Planning Obligations SPD is left suitably flexible to allow contributions to be sought from a broader spectrum of healthcare impacts, recognizing we have not yet established a defined methodology.

In recognition of the above need to look at all forms of health infrastructure it is proposed that the definition is considered in its widest form as part of the SPD. We acknowledge that contributions could only be sought based on a robust evidence base and a clear method of calculation for any financial contributions, or on-site provision sought. Our intention is to develop this framework during 2025.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The SPD was prepared in consultation with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board and NHS Property Services Ltd. One of the aims the SPD is to provide certainty around the type and nature of likely obligations having regard to policy requirements within the extant local plans. The SPD can and will be updated alongside the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan, which can then take account of any new evidence on the need for, and form of, healthcare infrastructure required to serve the districts.

## **Representation 200311 (Home Builders Federation)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

HBF is concerned about the use of this SPD to introduce additional financial burdens on a planning application. As they do not form part of the development plan, they cannot introduce new planning policies into the development plan.

The HBF is also concerned that this SPD is being introduced without the full consultation and examination that would have been given during the examination process, as would be befitting a new policy approach. PPG is clear that it is not appropriate for plan-makers to set out new formulaic approaches to planning document, as these would not be subject to examination.

The HBF considers that greater flexibility should be included within the SPD, this may include in relation to viability, scale of evidence required.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The SPD is supplemental guidance to give effect to extant local plan policies that were the subject of examination. The SPD has been reviewed following consultation and, where necessary, further clarity will be provided as to the extant policy requirement. The Councils are satisfied that the SPD does not seek to introduce new planning policies.

As set out at paragraph 1.26, the SPD follows PPG guidance. The Councils are content that the SPD provides the flexibility sought. In particular, the SPD is clear that the LPA will consider each application on its merits and only those obligations relevant to the specific development proposal will be considered, having regard also to site circumstances, development viability and other material considerations. In most instances, the expectation in policy and from the LPA is that the policy requirements will be met in full through the considered design of a development proposal.

## **Representation 200277 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Concern that the SPD is being introduced without comprehensive consultation and examination typically afforded during the examination process, which is appropriate for a new policy approach. It is inappropriate for plan-makers to establish evidence base documents, as these would not undergo examination. To remedy this position, it would be necessary to remove all formulaic contribution requirements that are not justified from the SPD. The SPD should highlight the viability review mechanism to ensure that schemes can continue to deliver where possible.

### **Councils' assessment**

The SPD is supplemental guidance to give effect to extant local plan policies that were the subject of examination. The SPD has been reviewed following consultation and, where necessary, further clarity will be provided as to the extant policy requirement. The Councils are satisfied that the SPD does not seek to introduce new planning policies.

The process for raising viability concerns is set out in detail within the SPD at paragraphs 2.48 – 2.56.

### **Representation 200175 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

We are supportive of this SPD for the reasons set out in paragraph 1.3.

#### **Councils' assessment**

General support for the SPD is duly noted.

### **Representation 200189 (National Highways)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

We have reviewed the document and note that details set out within the document are unlikely to have a severe impact on the operation of the trunk road and we offer No Comment.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted.

### **Representation 200342 (Central Bedfordshire Council)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The draft planning Obligations SPD includes some good approaches to s106, particularly for Green Infrastructure, community facilities and burial spaces. However, it does not acknowledge that there may be instances where cross boundary infrastructure needs to be considered, and contributions sought towards transport, healthcare or education. The adopted Central Bedfordshire Planning Obligations SPD 2024 acknowledges that infrastructure required to serve new growth in Central Bedfordshire may be provided in neighbouring administrative areas.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils acknowledge that the impact of any development should be considered in its widest context and not be constrained by administrative boundaries and that, as a matter of principle a development in one Local Planning Authority Area could be required to contribute towards infrastructure in another. Additional text has been included in the introductory chapter at paragraph 1.39 of the SPD to cover this principle.

### **Representation 200366 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Overall, the use of "per bedroom" obligations is unhelpful. There is a significant difference between the population yield per bedroom for different tenures and types of housing; and even more so specifically for specialist housing that could be associated with the University, its students and workers.

In general, it is more appropriate to have a per population estimate on demand- which can be adapted to specific circumstances of a development.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The use of 'per bedroom' is the recognised method to calculate population yield for the majority forms of housing provided for by the Local Plans. Specialist housing may generate a different yield per bedroom, which will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis.

### **Representation 200530 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

There is no source provided for many of the costs set out in the document and it would be helpful and transparent for this to be provided. The costs listed need to be explicit about what they include or exclude, for example fixtures, fittings and furniture, so that additional costs are not levied in addition if not required. This appears in some cases but not all.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils has updated the SPD to ensure that, where costs are set out, the source has been provided. The review undertaken of specific infrastructure costs will be published for consultation alongside re-consultation on the updated draft of the SPD in Summer 2025.

### **Representation 200393 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP support the purpose of a Planning Obligations SPD to provide supplementary planning guidance on planning obligations required to secure infrastructure necessary to support the needs generated by proposed developments.

However, the exact nature of some contributions and how certain financial contributions are calculated and justified, is questioned.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The comment is noted and the specific queries raised by U+I Ltd and Cambridge 4 LLP to specific obligations have been responded to.

### **Representation 200413 (Folwmere Parish Council)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

FPC is also concerned at failures to monitor the progress of developments. FPC urges SCDC to put fully effective monitoring and enforcement measures in place to ensure that benefits and infrastructure are not lost or delayed.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils are unaware of any developments or for developers failing to adhere to section 106 provisions. The Councils actively monitor developments through several means including site visits. Robust section 106 monitoring systems are in place recording the status of each development and each

individual covenant. Moreover, the status of all planning obligations is published in real time on the GCSP website.

#### **Representation 200436 (Mr Howard Felstead)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

It is crucial that the SPD makes clear that no planning obligations may be sought in relation to a particular proposed development pursuant to Chapters 4-23 of the SPD unless they are fully justified in accordance with Regulation 122 and paragraph 58 of the NPPF.

##### **Councils' assessment**

The comment is duly noted. The Council considers this is already clearly set out in paragraphs 1.22 – 1.25 of the SPD.

#### **Representation 200437 (Mr Howard Felstead)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

The drafted SPD does not appear to give sufficient emphasis to paragraph 58 of the NPPF. To avoid the risk that the SPD is followed without proper consideration of the legal and policy tests, it would be beneficial for the SPD to state that it is not appropriate to seek any of the planning obligations referred to within it other than to the extent that they satisfy the requirements Regulation 122.

##### **Councils' assessment**

The comment is duly noted. The Council considers this is already clearly set out at paragraphs 1.22 – 1.25 of the SPD, including that it is unlawful for obligations to be sought that do not meet all of the 3 tests.

#### **Representation 200456 (Tor & Co on behalf of Hill Residential Ltd (Hill))**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD seeks to follow guidance in the PPG, in particular, paragraph 004 (23b-004-201901) which states that policies on planning obligations should be informed by evidence and that it is not appropriate to set out formulaic approaches to planning obligations in supplementary planning documents. Hill welcomes this approach and the SPD's confirmation that each application is to be assessed on its merits and only those obligations necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms will be requested.

##### **Councils' assessment**

General support for the SPD is duly noted.

#### **Representation 200465 (Tor & Co on behalf Hill Residential Ltd (Hill))**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

As a general point, it is suggested that all tables within the SPD be given identification numbers.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils agree and have updated the tables within the SPD to have appropriate identification numbering.

### **Representation 200535 (British Horse Society)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

This SPD promotes urban style walking, cycling and wheeling opportunities from which horse riders are excluded but promotes off road access for these groups, often designed to bring cyclists on the inside of horse riders which is contrary to the highway code and impacts negatively on road safety for all users. There is opportunity within this SPD to correct the imbalance and improve the rights of way provision.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The SPD is intended to help developers better understand local plan requirements and for decision takers to assess the sustainability credentials of development proposals. Whilst it re-emphasises that developers are required to contribute towards the network of public rights of way for vulnerable traffic it does not and cannot address how infrastructure delivery decisions will be made.

## **Chapter 2: Approach to Planning Obligations**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 11

### **Representation 200270 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The monitoring fees in paragraph 2.38 appear excessive with the potential for a 10 unit residential scheme to be faced with monitoring costs of £5,000 which would not be proportionate. Further justification should be provided for these costs - particularly in the context of the substantial planning application fee increases which are due to take place in April 2025.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Planning guidance states that authorities can charge a monitoring fee to cover the cost of monitoring and reporting on delivery of that s106 obligation. It goes on to say that fees could be a fixed percentage of the total value of the s106 agreement or individual obligation; or could be a fixed monetary amount per agreement obligation (for example, for in-kind contributions). However, in all cases, monitoring fees must be proportionate and reasonable and reflect the actual cost of monitoring. As a helpful guide, and a useful benchmark, up to 5% of receipts may be directed towards the cost of administering the Community Infrastructure Levy.

The Councils maintain the view that a bespoke fee schedule is appropriate, as this ensures the fee payable reflects the work required to monitor the agreement. However, having reviewed the proposed rates the Councils agree that in some cases these may be disproportionate.

The base monitoring fee is therefore proposed to change from £1,000 to £750. The additional fee applied where financial contributions are payable will change from £1,500 to £1,000.

### **Representation 200278 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

According to the PPG (Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 23b-004-20190901), it is inappropriate for plan-makers to establish new formulaic approaches to planning obligations in supplementary planning documents or supporting evidence base documents, as these would not undergo examination. To remedy this position, it would be necessary to remove all formulaic contribution requirements that are not robustly justified from the SPD.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils are content that the draft SPD accords with national planning practice guidance. As stated at paragraph 1.26 of the SPD, applications will be assessed on their individual merits, having regard to site circumstances. The SPD seeks only to provide clarity on the level or cost of contributions that are likely to be sought should a development fail to deliver a relevant policy requirement on-site or to mitigate the impact of the development. In such circumstance, only those obligations necessary to make a specific development acceptable in planning terms will be sought.

### **Representation 200348 (Turley on behalf of Vistry Strategic Land)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

We note that the SPD seeks to establish new policy requirements and expectations which are not contained within adopted Development Plan Documents.

This SPD should only provide more detailed advice or guidance on policies in the adopted Local Plans. The SPD should not, as appears to be the case in some circumstances, seek to amend or change the requirements of the adopted Local Plans.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The SPD is supplemental guidance to give effect to extant local plan policies that were the subject of examination. The SPD has been reviewed following consultation and, where necessary, further clarity has been provided as to the extant policy requirement. The Councils are satisfied that the SPD does not seek to introduce new planning policies.

### **Representation 200358 (Turley on behalf of Vistry Strategic Land)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Neither Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule, although both have previously consulted on one. Paragraphs 1.18-1.19 of the SPD highlight that the Councils are continuing to review whether CIL should be introduced to support the delivery of the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan. If a CIL is introduced, we note that this should not duplicate existing obligations. We reserve the right to comment further on CIL matters if this progresses and we note that future CIL requirements could have further viability implications alongside those highlighted above.



### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. If and when the Councils introduce a CIL, its preparation will accord with Part 3 of the Regulations. Rates will be set having regard to development viability. Prior to introduction, the Councils will review its guidance on the use of S106 to ensure both mechanisms work in tandem and there is no 'double counting' of contributions to specific infrastructure.

### **Representation 200367 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 2.50 states that viability appraisals should follow a recognised UK professional standard, such as the RICS Red Book. The SPG should instead signpost to Planning Practice Guidance on Viability, as they are specifically designed to address the unique context of planning decisions.

Paragraph 2.54 makes clear the expectation that viability discussions must be concluded to the satisfaction of the LPA before any meaningful negotiations between the applicant and the LPA can commence, and similar expectations are set out in paragraph 4.32. The need for early engagement during the pre-application stage is acknowledged and encouraged, to allow for matters on housing and viability to be progressed as far as is reasonably practical. However, recognising that there may be matters unresolved / subject to change, this should not prevent an application from being submitted.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils agree that the SPD should be amended to refer to NPPG development viability guidance. Officers are currently considering the amendments required to Paragraphs 2.49 – 2.51 to give effect to this prior to re-consulting on the draft SPD in Summer 2025. Appendix B will also be updated as required.

The SPD highlights the risk of applications being submitted where matters of viability remain unresolved but does not prevent an applicant from submitting a planning application.

### **Representation 200394 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP)) and Representation 200571 (Carter Jonas on behalf of various named client)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Regarding paragraph 2.26, it is not considered reasonable or lawful to link contributions to the date of committee resolution or the consultation date identifying the contribution amounts. It is requested that this sentence is removed from the SPD.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Planning obligations are required to mitigate the impact of development. Typically, indexation will apply from the date of the deed, however, this approach disregards the amount of time that may lapse since the application was consulted on or the Committee resolution, meaning that contributions may not be adequate to address the impact of development given rising inflation cost. In such



circumstances the Councils may either increase the contribution ahead of the deed being completed or for expediency include indexation provisions with an earlier start date.

### **Representation 200439 (Mr Howard Felstead)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

In relation to paragraph 2.3. Whilst accelerating the planning process and the negotiation of s.106 obligations has numerous benefits, but the reference to a planning obligation being signed before Committee poses practical difficulties and rather than speeding the process up, may lead to committee meetings being delayed to meet this objective.

Paragraph 2.19 states "planning obligations run with the land, all owners, lessees and mortgagees must be signatories." This is an oversimplification and often wrong. The appropriate signatories in the context of each particular case are matters for the Councils' lawyers to advise on. The statement should allow for flexibility.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils are keen to see the planning process accelerated but agree that there may be practical difficulties to getting obligations completed for Planning Committee. Therefore, alternative wording will be proposed for the second bullet point of paragraph 2.3.

Paragraph 2.19 will also be amended to provide the flexibility sought.

### **Representation 200441 (Mr Howard Felstead)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 2.39 states "The base fee of £1,000 is payable within 30 days of completion of the s106 Agreement with the balance due upon commencement of development." It is not clear why any monitoring fee is due until commencement of development. This requirement should be deleted.

Paragraph 2.40 – Interest at five percent above the base rate appears excessive and disproportionate.

Paragraph 2.41- Currently the paragraph is legally incorrect and jumbles together various different statutory power and requirements. Inaccuracies should be addressed to ensure the SPD is legally correct and consistent with statutory requirements.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Having received planning permission and signed a s106 Agreement, the expectation of all parties is that the development will proceed. Once the s106 Agreement is signed and prior to commencement of the development, the Councils still have an obligation to monitor the Agreement, including: registering it on the Local Land Charges Registry; recording obligation triggers and monitoring these; the setting up of unique financial codes specific to the Agreement so that any financial receipts can be easily identified; liaising with delivery services on triggers

and likely receipt of financial contributions to ensure these are accounted for in their future works programmes; and accounting for the Agreement in annual reporting requirements. The Councils consider the developer should be responsible for covering the costs incurred by the Council in undertaking these requirements, even if the developer subsequently chooses not to commence the development.

Interest is only applicable where a contribution due to be made by the liable party is paid late. No charge is applied where liable parties meet their obligations. The purpose of the clause is to ensure that the local authorities receive contributions as per the agreed triggers such that they can in turn deliver the infrastructure necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It is intended to penalise non-compliance of the terms of the contribution therefore cannot reasonably be considered excessive or disproportionate.

Paragraph 2.41 seeks to acknowledge that some developers may, due to circumstances outside of their control, run into difficulty in meeting the obligations they have agreed to, including triggers for payment of financial contributions. In such circumstances, the Councils would welcome an early dialogue around potential options and solutions. The Councils will consider how the paragraph may be reworded prior to re-consulting on the draft SPD in Summer 2025.

#### **Representation 200443 (Mr Howard Felstead)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 2.68 states “A person against whom an affordable housing requirement is enforceable may apply to the Council for its variation or modification pursuant to s106A.”

This is also legally incorrect and incomplete. Section 106BA provides for modification or discharge of affordable housing requirements by application. Affordable housing requirements may also be varied by agreement under s.106A(1)(a).

##### **Councils’ assessment**

The Councils note that Sections 106BA, 106BB and 106BC of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 were sunset at the end of April 2016 – see [Section 106 affordable housing requirements: review and appeal - GOV.UK](#). Reference to s106A is deemed to include subsections of the same clause.

#### **Representation 200557 (Cambridgeshire County Council)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

It would be good to see climate change and carbon embedded throughout the chapters, as a reminder to developers that delivery of planning obligations must adhere to the relevant policies in the Local Plans.

##### **Councils’ assessment**

The comment is duly noted. However, the SPD can only reflect the extant local plan policies as they relate to the requirements upon new development to address the impacts of climate change and the reduction of carbon, not in delivery of the planning

obligations themselves unless discharging the obligation triggers the policy requirement.

### **Representation 200586 (Cambridgeshire County Council)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

It would be good to see climate change and carbon embedded throughout the chapters, as a reminder to developers that delivery of any planning obligations must adhere to the relevant policies in the Local Plans (such as Policy 28 & 29 from the Cambridge Local Plan and CC/1 and CC/3 from the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan).

The County Council welcomes that the SPD references digital connectivity in existing local plans, however stronger digital connectivity proposals, particularly around mobile connectivity could be implemented through the SPD.

We welcome the inclusion of biodiversity and public open space within this document, particularly the explanation of how planning obligations will be used to secure biodiversity net gain. The use of planning obligations to delivery public open space will be important for both health & wellbeing and reducing visitor pressures on existing wildlife sites.

#### **Councils' assessment**

See response to representation 200557.

The comments on digital connectivity are noted. However, the Councils note the focus of the extant policies concerns broadband connectivity rather than mobile connectivity. Increasing the scope of the policy is matter that can be addressed through the emerging Local Plan.

The comments of support are noted and welcomed.

## **Chapter 3: How to use this Supplementary Planning Document**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 2

### **Representation 200357 (Turley on behalf of Vistry Statagic Land)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD is seemingly seeking to introduce additional obligations on new developments which were not taken account of at the Local Plan stage. While we highlight specific contributions later in these representations, we note the Councils' starting point will be that planning applications are viable given the viability assessment work undertaken at the Local Plan stage. However, it is noted that the SPD consultation document has not been subject to any viability assessment, or if it has been this assessment has not been made public alongside the consultation.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The SPD is supplemental guidance to give effect to extant local plan policies that were the subject of examination. The SPD has been reviewed

following consultation and, where necessary, further clarity will be provided as to the extant policy requirement. The Councils are satisfied that the SPD does not seek to introduce new planning policies.

The extant policy requirements within both Local Plans were the subject of viability assessment. There is no evidence to suggest that the conclusions reached in the original viability assessments needs revisiting. Rather, more recent viability benchmarking ([see paper](#)), undertaken in support of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals, continues to clearly demonstrate that development across Greater Cambridge remains viable even with the higher policy requirements being proposed through the emerging Local Plan.

The base monitoring fee is proposed to change from £1,000 to £750. The additional fee applied where financial contributions are payable are proposed to change from £1,500 to £1,000.

#### **Representation 200279 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

No comment in relation to Chapter 3 of the SPD.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted.

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

Total representations received for this Chapter: 8

#### **Representation 200212 (CUH NHS Foundation Trust) and Representation 200416 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

The general approach to affordable housing contributions is welcomed; however, following the publication of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus Housing Study – Establishing the housing needs of the CBC workforce (2024), CUH is committed to working with Local Planning Authorities to develop a mechanism by which the housing needs of the campus workforce can be delivered through the growth agenda and at the same time delivering the healthcare provision to support the growth agenda.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The SPD refers to the Councils Joint Housing Strategy that provides guidance of conventional and innovative housing needs as supported by evidence and having regard to overall housing requirements and needs.

#### **Representation 200272 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

In relation to smaller scale major developments there is a significant issue presently around the delivery of Section 106 housing through registered providers (RP) with many sites unable to contract with an RP. Review mechanisms need to be

considered and built in to S106 Agreements. I have attached the BHF Bid Farwell publication which sets the scene and suggests solutions. In order to deliver small and medium scale housing schemes flexibility is required.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Generally, the Councils are not aware there is a problem with RP's acquiring smaller sites in Cambridge. Both Councils have relationships with smaller RP's that will acquire affordable homes within smaller schemes. However, the Councils are aware that, in some cases, offers have been made by RP's but that the developer has paid too much for the land and the offers from RP's are not financially viable for them to accept. In most instances, the best course of action would be for the developer to involve the Housing Strategy Team to see if they can facilitate a conversation with more suitable RP's or to agree an alternative approach. The SPD encourages and welcomes developers to engage with the Councils on the delivery of the affordable homes. In this respect, the Councils are likely to accept a cascade mechanism within a S106 Agreement to manage the potential scenario raised in the representation. As such, an additional paragraph has been included within the SPD at the end of the section on 'negotiation of affordable housing' to reference provision for a cascade mechanism.

#### **Representation 200395 Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

Currently in Paragraph 4.30 it states that "the council will expect a revised viability assessment to be submitted where any scheme has unavoidably stalled for 12 months". A more reasonable timescale of 18 months is suggested.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils consider 12 months to be a reasonable period.

#### **Representation 200280 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraphs 4.22-4.24 provide guidance on the tenure Mix of development with detailed breakdown of the percentage of affordable tenure. However, these standards and need may change over time. An additional paragraph is needed, the mix described within these paragraphs should be used unless sufficient evidence demonstrates a different appropriate mix should be provided.

Paragraph 4.30- Additional guidance should be added for completeness to address phased developments which provide increased affordable housing Plan an earlier phase to allow for a reduction in another.

Regarding Paragraph 4.33, whilst it is noted that planning statements and design access statements are often the most suitable place for submitting the information described. South Cambridgeshire District Council's validation checklist requires an Affordable Housing Statement to be submitted. It is suggested that the SPD guidance should be consistent with the validation requirements. In addition to enable some flexibility, the wording should be changed to allow the applicant to submit said material in the most appropriate form.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Guidance on the housing mix is set out in the Councils Joint Housing Strategy. The provision to depart from these is set out in paragraphs 4.27 and 4.28 of the SPD.

The Councils are content that the guidance is sufficient and clear. The expectation is that for phased developments a policy compliant level of affordable homes will be delivered within each phase. An exception to this would be where it could be demonstrated that an alternative approach would deliver a materially greater number of affordable homes across the development as a whole.

Amendments have been made to Paragraph 4.28 to include references to Affordable Housing Statements and to increase the flexibility of how necessary affordable housing details can be provided as part of a planning application.

### **Representation 200312 (Home Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD states that the affordable housing policies will apply to schemes for specialist housing (such as extra care, retirement homes, residential and / or nursing care, care suites). It also states that the affordable housing policies apply to Build to Rent schemes. The viability of these requirements should be evidenced and ensured.

The LP policies do not set out a tenure split, however the SPD does. It is important to ensure that this proposed tenure split is viable and developable. It will also be important for the Councils to work closely with local registered providers to ensure that these requirements are in line with their plan in the area.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The tenure split for affordable housing is provided in the Councils Joint Housing Strategy which provides detailed evidence on local housing needs ([see link](#)). The SPD now directs applicants to that guidance.

Recent viability benchmarking ([see paper](#)), undertaken in support of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals, continues to clearly demonstrate that residential development, including Build to Rent, remains viable even with the higher policy requirements proposed through the emerging Local Plan.

### **Representation 200561 (Home Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD suggests that the Council's expectations on the affordable housing mix by bedrooms as a starting point, is set out in Tables 2 & 3 of Annex 2 of the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy 2024-2029. The suggested mix is not included in the SPD, and it is not apparent how it will be kept up to date should new evidence from monitoring or a housing needs assessment indicate that these are no longer correct. HBF suggest a new paragraph is introduced stating that the suggested mix in Annex 2 of the Cambridge Housing Strategy will apply unless sufficient evidence demonstrates a different appropriate mix.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. It is recognised by the Councils that it will be easier and more appropriate to update Annex 2 of the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy than the Planning Obligations SPD, and hence why it is preferable for the SPD to reference the Annex as the source of current expectations on affordable housing mix. Nevertheless, the SPD already clearly sets out in Paragraphs 4.27 and 4.28 that development proposals may depart from the expected affordable housing mix, where sufficient justification is provided with the planning application.

### **Representation 200572 (Carter Jonas on behalf of various named clients)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 4.14 deals with BTR schemes. In the second bullet point it states "a minimum of 20% homes in BTR development of 10 or more will be required to be provided as Affordable to Private Rent. The Councils will seek to achieve a higher percentage than this wherever possible. A similar point is made in the fourth bullet point.

The SPD currently provides no guidance as to when and on what basis, a higher percentage may be sought.

Paragraph 4.21- The council should clarify that it will not seek nomination for BTR schemes, but it will be the BTR provider.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The section dealing with non-conventional or specialist housing has been removed from section 4 of the SPD. However, this section of the SPD continues to refer to the Councils Joint Housing Strategy that provides guidance on the need for these different forms of housing, including where affordability is a consideration.

A new paragraph 4.16 has been included to clarify that the Councils will not seek nomination for BTR schemes.

## **Chapter 5: Green Infrastructure**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 7

### **Representation 200171(Cambridge Past, Present and Future)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

This approach to getting investment in GI is supported. However, we need to ensure that the money is sufficient to manage the sites in the long term and not just for the first 15 years. Investing the funds in an endowment which provides a return sufficient for long term maintenance of the land should be considered.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Historic planning obligation guidance (the ODPM Circular 05/2005) states that maintenance contributions for infrastructure that is to be used by



the wider public should reflect the time lag between the provision of the new facility and its inclusion in public sector funding streams, or its ability to recover its own costs. The Councils consider that the maximum contribution that could be sought to cover this time lag is 15 years.

### **Representation 200271 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 5.7 suggests that this would apply to all residential and commercial developments regardless of their scale. There is no stated commercial formula to work out the contribution. It seems excessive to also seek contributions from single or minor scale new dwellings and therefore the threshold should relate to major development. By introducing a S106 requirement for minor scale development this will slow up the planning process for those applications and potentially reduce delivery for small and medium sized developers.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan policy NH/6 requires all developments to contribute towards green infrastructure, however, the supporting text to policy SC/4 confirms that, reflecting Planning Practice Guidance, the Council will not seek tariff style Section 106 contributions for general off site infrastructure improvements from sites under 10 dwellings (and which have a combined gross floor space of no more than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>). The threshold will therefore be amended to clarify that obligations will only be considered from Major development proposals.

### **Representation 200281 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

No comment in relation to Chapter 5 of the SPD.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted.

### **Representation 200349 (Jaynic)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD states that all new residential and commercial development is to make provision to enhance the Green Infrastructure network. Applications should consider and detail how they are addressing the requirement to enhance the Green Infrastructure network.

Whilst we acknowledge that it is a requirement for all development to contribute to the Green Infrastructure Network, where Green Infrastructure enhancement is not part of an onsite proposal, there needs to be an off-sites contributions table for commercial which reflects the residential dwelling contributions table and sets out the Council's expectations for financial contributions based on commercial floorspace where Green Infrastructure cannot sufficiently be provided on site.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Whilst the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan policy NH/6 requires all developments to contribute towards green infrastructure all contributions must be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. The impact and mitigation



necessary for residential developments is more definable and a table has been produced setting out the necessary contributions associated with residential developments. The approach is less defined for non-residential developments and therefore contributions will be sought having regard to the proximity of the development to green infrastructure, the impact that is judged to be experienced and the specific measures required to address this.

### **Representation 200359 (Turley on behalf of Vistry Strategic Land)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD presents a contribution table. While this appears to relate to South Cambridgeshire only, the structure of the SPD's supporting text would make it appear that the contribution could cover both authority areas based on the sub-heading format set out in the SPD. While the supporting text of the SPD does not imply this, it is not explicit in confirming the approach and the way the information presented is somewhat unclear. We suggest that the Councils review how this is presented and confirm that the contribution calculation is only required within South Cambridgeshire.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils agree that the SPD needs to be more explicit that the table reflects contributions to be secured in South Cambridgeshire only. The title for Table 5-1 has therefore been amended to state this is for developments within South Cambridgeshire.

### **Representation 200429 (Natural England)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

We welcome that a link has been provided to Natural England's GI framework in the Further Guidance section. We advise that it is referred to the text in Chapter 5 perhaps in paragraphs 5.6 or 5.8.

We also recommend that paragraph 5.8 suggests that GI contributions should be evidence-led and aligned with strategic planning.

The upcoming Local Nature Reserve Strategy will also set out biodiversity opportunities and accessible natural greenspace measure. The SPD could therefore provide guidance that future planning obligations should seek to contribute to achieving these measures.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils will consider making the amendments to Paragraph 5.6 or 5.8 as suggested.

An aim of the SPD is to provide certainty around the type and nature of likely obligations having regard to policy requirements within the extant local plans. The SPD can and will be updated alongside the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan, which can then take account of any new evidence including the upcoming Local Nature Reserve Strategy.

## **Representation 200531 (British Horse Society)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

GI is included in the South Cambs Local Plan. It is included in the Cambridge Local Plan. GI is included in the District Design Guide. However, the definitions of GI are different within these documents. In some, rights of way are included as part of GI, in others, including this SPD, they are not.

It would be very easy to misinterpret GI as green rural public paths and conclude that the need to protect and enhance the rural rights of way network is covered under this heading. It is not. Can this section be revisited to clarify what is included in GI and the rights of way section.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Whilst the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 definition of Green Infrastructure makes specific reference to rights of way, the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 definition of Green Infrastructure does not.

The definition of Green Infrastructure cannot be amended through a Supplementary Planning Document, however, this will be revisited during preparation of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

In the meantime, the Councils will continue to assess each application and where adverse access is caused, contributions towards mitigating this, including to upgrade rights of way, will be secured.

## **Chapter 6: Biodiversity**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 5

### **Representation 200161 (Mr John Meed)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Section 6 states that 'BNG can be delivered on-site or off-site (through purchasing biodiversity credits or enhancing nearby habitats)'. However, while Paragraphs 6.20-6.25 place considerable emphasis on off-site BNG, there is no further reference to near-site BNG. I propose a new Paragraph 6.21 which states that:

'Where species classified as 'vulnerable to extinction' or 'near threatened' in the UK are present on a site, a separate mitigation package will be required for these species adjacent to the areas impacted and steps must be taken to improve sufficient appropriate habitat in nearby, adjoining areas to accommodate the displaced species.'

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. A new paragraph 6.21 has been included to reflect suggested wording.

## **Representation 200172 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD appears to focus on BNG yet there might be other areas that S106 should be used for to deliver other biodiversity benefits and mitigation which should be referenced in the SPD.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Reference is made to the adopted Greater Cambridge Biodiversity SPD that provides practical advice and guidance on how to develop proposals that comply with the NPPF and local plan policies on delivering improvements to biodiversity. It is not considered necessary to repeat these again within the Planning Obligations SPD.

## **Representation 200282 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon) and Representation 200313 (Homes Builders Federation)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 6.8 lists some of the exemptions for BNG on new developments. All exemptions should be listed.

This SPD should include reference to the provision of BNG on other land under the ownership of the applicant. This change may encourage more local BNG delivery.

The SPD should not be putting undue pressure on applicants to enter into S106 agreements, particularly for smaller scale projects, when the delivery of BNG can be controlled via other mechanisms.

Regarding Paragraph 6.24, the approach claiming off site provision cannot be made without a s106 agreement, is incorrect and should be amended to include reference to the 'conservation covenant'. As this covenant sits with the land it is sufficient to ensure the long term BNG and management. Reference to national credit scheme should also be included.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. As the Councils are not responsible for deciding what will be exempt from the requirements for BNG, it is considered more appropriate to provide a weblink within the SPD to DEFRA guidance on the Government's website, to ensure applicants can check the most up to date list of exemptions.

As set out in the SPD, the Councils will always prioritise the use of conditions where appropriate. The Councils will consider further amendments to address the use of a 'covenant' and to make suitable reference to the national credit scheme.

## **Representation 200282 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon), Representation 200313 (Homes Builders Federation) and Representation 200350 (Jaynic)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

The draft SPD states in paragraph 6.4 that best practice indicates that there is an aspiration policy to achieve a 20% BNG and in paragraph 6.9 that the Council will encourage applicants to achieve 20%. Whilst recognising this is not framed as a requirement HBF would suggest that it is made clear that development achieving

10% will be considered as providing a positive contribution to biodiversity and will be supported by the Council.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The draft SPD references the aspiration set out in the adopted Greater Cambridge Biodiversity SPD. However, that remains an aspiration rather than a requirement. An amendment to paragraph 6.9 has been made to clarify this point.

### **Representation 200350 (Jaynic)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

We acknowledge that BNG is now mandatory and that the 10% gain is the current requirement in the Local Planning Authority with an aspiration for 20%. We ask for clarification as to the length of validity for older surveys to be used for planning applications, where there has been no material change to the onsite habitat. We ask the Council to quantify a validity period for clarity and assume that the timescales will reflect the industry standard validity set out by the CIEEM.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. With respect to the length of validity for the use of older surveys, the Councils note that anything that was submitted post February/April 2024 will require latest statutory metric to calculate BNG baseline. Further consideration will be given to whether the SPD is the right place to quantify validity periods noting different surveys have different validity periods.

### **Representation 200282 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon), Representation 200313 (Homes Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

In particular the Council should amend paragraph 6.24 which suggests that without a S106 agreement is in place BNG conditions will not be discharged. Clearly if a conservation covenant is in place then a S106 agreement is not required in order to discharge that condition.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils have also amended relevant paragraphs to clarify that BNG monitoring fees are only applicable where BNG is provided onsite and that, where the applicant is to purchase BNG credits to discharge a planning condition, that no BNG monitoring fee is required.

## **Chapter 7: Community Facilities**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 11

### **Representation 200273 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The contribution is to be sought from all residential developments, mixed-use and major commercial developments. There is no stated formula for commercial developments. Applying a contribution to non-major housing schemes is considered

to be inappropriate. This will delay planning applications and undermine delivery of schemes. The requirement should only apply to major housing proposals.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. People working in Cambridge do and will continue to access community facilities to meet their recreation and leisure needs. Further large-scale commercial development will see additional pressure placed on local facilities. Contributions for non-residential developments will only be considered for developments that exceed 5,000 m<sup>2</sup> with the quantum of contributions having regard to the planning use, the proximity of the development to indoor community facilities, the impact that is judged to be experienced and the specific measures required to address this.

#### **Representation 200283 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 7.8 references a new study that has been commissioned from Cambridge ACRE- Savills were unable to find the document, if yet published this reference should be altered.

Paragraph 7.10 should be written to improve clarity as what type of developments should be sought.

Wording should read as follows

“All new residential, mixed use (with an element of residential), and major commercial developments (where there is a demonstrable need are to ....”

Regarding Paragraph 7.24 Savills would like to emphasise that any request for contribution to these projects across the city must meet the tests as set out as statutory tests in regulation 122.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. An update of the Community Facilities Study was published in May 2025 that involved Cambridge ACRE surveying all village facilities to identify needs. The reference to the study has been amended to reference its formal publication date.

Paragraph 7.10 has been amended as suggested

Paragraph 126 of the SPD states ' Each application is to be assessed on its merits and only those obligations necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms will be requested.'

With regard to obligations being subject to statutory tests and regulations, the Council considers this is already clearly set out in paragraphs 1.22 – 1.25 of the SPD.

## **Representation 200314 (Homes Builders Federation)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

It is important that the Council has robust evidence to demonstrate that the contributions proposed in this SPD are necessary and directly related to the development. The HBF considers that in order for this policy to function it will be important that the Council has detailed evidence about the community facilities that are already available in the Greater Cambridge area, and their current capacity to meet local community needs. The HBF also considers that if provision is provided on-site, for one form of community facility that the Council will not seek provision for further facilities.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. An update of the Community Facilities Study was produced by Cambridge ACRE and published in May 2025 ([see paper](#)). This study contains detailed evidence of current capacity of community facilities across the district which will be used alongside the SPD to inform when section 106 contributions are required.

## **Representation 200351 (Jaynic)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD states that all new residential, mixed-use, and major commercial developments are to make provision for community facilities to meet the needs arising from the development proposal.

Large scale commercial developments (above 5,000m<sup>2</sup>) will be required to consider how the needs of their workers and visitors will be met for social and leisure facilities. If the need cannot be met through existing or additional onsite facilities an offsite contribution to address the impact on facilities is necessary and will be sought.

Jaynic are of the opinion that with regards to commercial development, community facilities should be on a case-by-case basis, particularly as in some locations there are already other facilities which can be utilised by new occupiers, and providing additional such space could jeopardize the sustainability of the existing facilities. Jaynic also query how Greater Cambridge are determining the quantum of offsite contribution for commercial units, there is no table with figures like there is for residential.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Contributions for non-residential developments will only be considered for developments that exceed 5,000 m<sup>2</sup> with the quantum of contributions having regard to the planning use, the proximity of the development to indoor community facilities, the impact that is judged to be experienced and the specific measures required to address this.

## **Representation 200360 (Turley on behalf of Vistry Strategic Land)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

We note that the SPD sets out a requirement for applications of more than 200 dwellings to provide detailed assessments and strategies on community needs. This

is a policy requirement in South Cambridgeshire within Policy SC/4 however the SPD extends this to Cambridge where a similar policy requirement does not exist.

The estimated costs appear to be based on the following (extracted from paragraphs 7.26-7.28 of the SPD):

- The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 sets a standard of 111m<sup>2</sup> per 1000 population.
- The cost of providing community centres is £4,020 per m<sup>2</sup> as a starting point for calculating developer contributions
- The cost associated with maintaining (utilities, decoration, services, etc) community facilities is £117.57 per m<sup>2</sup>.

The SPD has not set out the source of these costs and whether the costs indicated are representative of both Councils' areas where construction costs and land values may vary between the two. It is noted that other contributions (such as the Indoor Sport contribution commented below) do differentiate between the two areas. Moreover, while the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan does set a quantum of floorspace required, it does not set out how this would translate to how a potential contribution would be calculated and therefore would not have been subject to viability testing.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. An amendment has been added to clarify that the requirement on 200+ dwelling schemes is for South Cambridgeshire.

The Councils have published the source of the costs: Infrastructure Costing Review – Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD July 2025, which will be made available alongside re-consultation on the draft SPD. This includes the details on how the costs have been derived, including differences between the two authorities.

### **Representation 200368 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 7.22 states that funding for Community Workers could be required. While we understand that for very large developments a community co-ordination role can be valuable as part of the stewardship strategy in early phases; the paragraph then goes on to suggest this role could include youth workers or health workers.

While a community co-ordinator may indirectly have some role to play in supporting young people or the health of the community, the specific role of a youth worker or health worker is specialist and quite different from a general community development role – and is not a planning matter. This is raised again in paragraph 8.13 – the funding of mental health, domestic violence prevention etc are not planning matters and it is not practical or appropriate for those services to be delivered by or funded by an individual development/developer. These references should be removed from the SPD.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. A variety of community workers and roles may be needed to mitigate the impacts of a specific development. This would depend on the nature and



scale of development. Large scale and new communities bring particular challenges which need to be addressed and are specifically related to the development. For Northstowe for example a community support contribution was included in the Section 106 which supported community workers, youth workers and sports workers or workers engaged in or carrying out activities associated with matters such as ecology and sustainability and/or health impact related matters.

### **Representation 200396 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP) and Representation 200573 (Carter Jonas on behalf of various named clients)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 7.18 states that the starting point for the negotiation of faith space is 0.5 hectares or heavily discounted land per 3,000 dwellings. It is considered that this requirement should be based on an identified level of need in a geographical area, rather than an arbitrary standard requirement. It is also unclear how the 0.5 hectare figure has been derived and evidenced, and if the use of this obligation would make a development acceptable in planning terms.

Paragraph 7.19 uses the terminology 'pump priming contributions'. What this is and how it is applied to development should be explained in the supporting text or glossary.

Paragraph 7.22 where it states, "Community Support Workers could be required to address a range of issues" There appears to be no evidence to support this obligation. The obligation should be reviewed and justified against criteria set out in Regulation 122..

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Faith provision is a community need referenced in both adopted local plans as a potential need generated by new development. Proposals for sites of 200 or more dwellings (or groups of smaller sites which cumulatively exceed this figure) are required to provide detailed assessments and strategies regarding community needs and how they will be met. The faith space evidence quoted provides a starting point that can be explored in more detail through an individual application.

Pump priming is a term to describe the time lag between the provision of a new facility or service and its inclusion in public sector funding streams. This definition can be included in the text.

A variety of community workers and roles may be needed to mitigate the impacts of a specific development. Large scale and new communities bring particular challenges which need to be addressed and are specifically related to the development. It is reasonable that the developer mitigate these impacts in order that the development be considered acceptable.



## **Representation 200566 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP)) and Representation 200573 (Carter Jonas on behalf of various named clients**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 7.23 where it states “Small grants scheme (community chest): A contribution, to be agreed, will be required for the development of community grants or an investment fund to support local residents of the new development”. We consider this to be a broad requirement and again recommend that further evidence is provided.

Paragraph 7.27 states the cost of community centres as well as the costs associated with maintaining. It is unclear how these figures have been derived, what comparable schemes have been used and how these costs have been calculated in relation to specification. Same comments apply to figures in the community contribution by dwelling size table.

### **Councils’ assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils have a long history of securing modest contributions which the community can access to further develop a sense of community. Analysis shows that in recent between £8.95 and £14.29 per dwelling has been secured across growth sites such as Northstowe, Bourn Airfield, Genome Campus. A sum of £12.50 per dwelling is proposed to be included in the SPD.

The Councils have published the source of the costs: Infrastructure Costing Review – Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD July 2025, which will be made available alongside re-consultation on the draft SPD. This includes the details on how the costs have been derived, including costs for community centres.

## **Representation 200457 (Tor & Co on behalf of Hill Residential Ltd (Hill))**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Concern with the approach set out in paragraph 7.22 that the obligations for community facilities within large scale phased schemes could include temporary ‘meanwhile uses’. Hill recommend adding the following wording: “Where a need is identified planning obligations may be sought, subject to viability and in accordance with paragraph 58 of the NPPF, including: Meanwhile uses...”. This will ensure any obligations of this nature align with the requirements of national policy and are necessary, directly related to development and fair and reasonable in scale and kind.

### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. Proposals for sites of 200 or more dwellings (or groups of smaller sites which cumulatively exceed this figure) are required to provide detailed assessments and strategies regarding community needs and how they will be met. Meanwhile uses provide a means of supporting early stages of development. The need for them to be necessary and directly related, and viable is not disputed. These are considerations set out in the introductory chapter of the draft SPD but a reference to ‘viability’ has also been added here.

## **Representation 200458 (Tor & Co on behalf of Hill Residential Ltd (Hil))**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) sets a standard of 111m<sup>2</sup> per 1,000 people for contributions towards community facilities. This equates to 0.111m<sup>2</sup> per person, so 1m<sup>2</sup> would support 10 people (rounded up from 9.009). The cost of provision of a community facility is identified in the SPD as £4,020 per m<sup>2</sup> and the maintenance cost is identified as £117.57 per m<sup>2</sup> (it is unclear if this is per year or total cost, it is assumed to be the latter). Therefore, the total cost to provide 1m<sup>2</sup> of community space is £4137.57, which would equate to £413.76 per person. For a 1-bed property with an assumed population of 1.23 people (average occupancy set out in Appendix A) this would give a contribution of £508.92. It is therefore unclear how the value of £789.63 set out in the table after paragraph 7.28 has been reached.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The draft SPD sets out that each 1 bed dwelling requires 0.136 m<sup>2</sup> of indoor meeting space. At a rate of £4,020 per m<sup>2</sup> this equates to a capital contribution of £548.85. The cost of maintaining each m<sup>2</sup> of indoor meeting space is £117.57 per year (£1,764 over 15 years) therefore the maintenance cost per each 1 bed dwelling is £240.78. The combined capital and maintenance cost is therefore £789.63.

## **Chapter 8: Social and Community Support Services**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 3

## **Representation 200274 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

The threshold for contributions is again relative to all residential development and there is no formula for residential or commercial proposals. It is noted that the draft Health Impact Assessment applies (in South Cambs) to a threshold of 20 + dwellings. This would be an appropriate level at which to potentially seek contributions. Otherwise, smaller non-major housing schemes will face significant constraints to delivery owing to this and other financial contribution requirements.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The policy recognises that new, rather than developments in existing and settled communities, require higher social and community support services. Smaller non-major housing schemes will not likely require contributing towards this unless they form part of a larger local plan allocation or development.

## **Representation 200284 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Regarding Paragraph 8.10, we agree that engagement with Cambridgeshire County Council, NHS England and other stakeholders on these matters is important particularly as part of the HIA and provision provide where demonstrable need arising from the development. However, this raised the question of what if the stakeholder do not engage effectively with the application. Guidance should be added to ensure that developer will not be hindered in the decision-making process if stakeholders have failed to engage effectively or make changes to their preferred approach.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils expectation is that the stakeholders will engage. If a developer is having particular issues with stakeholder engagement, they are encouraged to discuss this with the LPA who will help facilitate, however, such a modification is not considered appropriate.

### **Representation 200315 (Homes Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD states that all new residential development, are to make adequate provision for health care, community and social facilities. It goes on to state that proposals for sites of 200 or more dwellings are required to provide detailed assessments and strategies regarding community needs and how they will be met.

The HBF considers that where a need is identified it will be crucial that this is discussed with the developer of the site affected at the earliest possible time to ensure that this can be built into costs associated with the development. The HBF considers that without further information in relation to potential costs for this requirement that there is potential for this to significant impacts on the viability of development, including in terms of land use and other impacts, not just direct financial costs.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The obligation to undertake detailed assessments and strategies prepared in consultation with service providers and approved by the local authority for proposals of 200 or more dwellings rests with the applicant.

## **Chapter 9: Social and Community Support Services**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 7

### **Representation 200275 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The approach appears to relate to all scales of residential development which is inappropriate in our view. There is also no formula or indication of the level of contribution that may be sought. Seeking contributions from non-major housing schemes will delay the determination of applications and undermine delivery.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The draft SPD cross references with the Museums Library and Archives Council (MLA) Standard Charge approach, which set out the level and tiers of contributions for different types of library provision, which have been used by the County Council since 2012 for all scales of development.

### **Representation 200285 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD suggests that the Cambridgeshire County Council Planning Obligations Strategy outlines the County's approach to securing contributions. However, this

information is not explicitly provided in the SPD, and it is unclear whether these figures will be updated or indexed, or what justification exists for their continued appropriateness. According to the SPD, contributions appear to range from £28.92 to £97 per head of population increase, based on the consultation draft planning obligations strategy 2016. Whilst Savills agrees with the Councils aim to promote life-long learning, Savills question the appropriateness of funding this initiative through residential development when evidence does not demonstrate it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The County Council uses the Museums Library and Archives Council (MLA) Standard Charge approach for determining the level of contributions for library service. This approach and the associated planning obligations have repeatedly been found to be robust and necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms

Paragraph 9.4 has been amended as suggested to clarify the type of mixed-use development to which the guidance is relevant.

### **Representation 200316 (Home Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD suggests that the Cambridgeshire County Council Planning Obligations Strategy outlines the County's approach to securing contributions. However, this information is not explicitly provided in the SPD, and it is unclear whether these figures will be updated or indexed, or what justification exists for their continued appropriateness. According to the SPD, contributions appear to range from £28.92 to £97 per head of population increase, based on the consultation draft planning obligations strategy 2016. Whilst Savills agrees with the Councils aim to promote life-long learning, Savills question the appropriateness of funding this initiative through residential development when evidence does not demonstrate it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The draft SPD cross references with the Museums Library and Archives Council (MLA) Standard Charge approach, which set out the level and tiers of contributions for different types of library provision, which have been used by the County Council since 2012 for all scales of development.

This approach and the associated planning obligations have repeatedly been found to be robust and necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms.

### **Representation 200369 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 9.8 should acknowledge the role of the Council in running library facilities. While it may be appropriate in some contexts for a developer to provide a library building, it should not be incumbent on that developer, or the volunteer time of the new community, to be made to run that facility. A library space or service should only be required as a planning obligation where there is demonstrable need and where

there are strategies in place to maintain it, that do not require a long term commitment from the developer to do so.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Paragraph 9.7 explains the statutory role of the County Council.

All developments will differ in terms of scale and proximity to existing services with capacity and therefore each development application is considered individually based on their merits and circumstances. Paragraph 9.8 provides an outline of the range of space and services requirements; however these will not apply in all cases.

#### **Representation 200397 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP) and 200574 (Carter Jonas on behalf of various named clients)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 9.8 states that where new housing development will have implications for the existing library provision they may require certain developer contributions. In the list of provisions that are given it is unclear whether the requirements are mutually exclusive. For example, if a new library building is provided, is the library fit out and new stock also required? We request a greater narrative is provided on this matter to improve developer expectations and improve transparency.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. All developments will differ in terms of scale and proximity to existing services with capacity and therefore each development proposal is considered individually on their merits and circumstances. Paragraph 9.8 provides an outline of the range of space and services requirements, however these will not apply in all cases.

The draft SPD cross references with the Museums Library and Archives Council (MLA) Standard Charge approach, which set out the level and tiers of contributions for different types of library provision, which have been used by the County Council since 2012 for all scales of development.

#### **Representation 200459 (Tor & Co on behalf of Hill Residential Ltd. (Hill))**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

It is suggested that this separate consideration of obligations for libraries be either moved to be included within Chapter 7: Community Facilities, or cross referenced in Chapter 7 for clarity.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils consider it appropriate to separate out library provision given the specific form and function of a library as compared with other types of community facilities.

## Chapter 10: Transport and Highways

Total representations received for this Chapter: 13

### Representation 200174 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The Transport section should provide strong hooks for requesting money for contribution towards sustainable transport infrastructure which is above and beyond that necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Hertfordshire CC have calculated a sum of £10,000 per dwelling.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The level of contributions/mitigation secured from a specific development will depend on the impact that development will have on the highway network ensuing the obligation is directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the specific development proposal.

### Representation 200188 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority)

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority note reference to their strategic document the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan. This is the basis of the overarching strategy to transport and connectivity and all policies, strategies and schemes need to align with the vision, goals and objectives.

#### **Councils' assessment**

The comment is duly noted. 'Overarching' will be included in the description of the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.

### Representation 200201 (British Horse Society)

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Review the definition of Active travel. Currently Active travel does not provide adequately for pedestrians wanting to access the countryside and walk on natural surfaces. Active travel paths for urban walking and cycling are needed in addition to rights of way paths, not instead of them.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. However, the Councils do not consider it to be the role of an SPD on Planning Obligations to promote an alternative definition of active travel. The comments have therefore been passed to the Cambridge County Council to consider in any future update of the Cambridgeshire Active Travel Strategy and Active Travel Toolkit.



## **Representation 200267 (Savills on behalf of MA Propco 11 Limited) and Representation 200329 (Savills on behalf of MA CSP 2 Limited)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

An objection is lodged to any suggested link between the non-consulted and non-evidenced County Highway Authority 'Transport Position Statement' of January 2025 and the updated Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils have reviewed Chapter 10 and are content that there is no reference to, or link suggested with, the Transport Position Statement of January 2025. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the Transport Position Statement is not capable of being a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

## **Representation 200286 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Chapter 10 described the Cambridgeshire Active Travel Strategy (Cambridgeshire County Council) and Active Travel Toolkit. The chapter fails to make reference to the role of Active Travel England, who from June 2024 became a statutory consultee for outline, full and hybrid applications as set out in paragraph 10.9 Active Travel Toolkit. Guidance should include recommendations that applicants engage with Active Travel England as early as possible if their proposal meets the threshold.

Savills recommend that paragraph 10.13 reads as follows. "Consequently, there is no development threshold below which an obligation for transport infrastructure may not be required and there are no types of development that would be exempt from transport infrastructure requirements. *Unless agreed with the Local Highways Authority and other relevant parties.*".

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Additional reference will be added to Active Travel England and their role. The proposed additional text at 10.13 is not considered necessary.

## **Representation 200335 (Cambridge Science Park)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

An objection is lodged to any suggested or implied link between the non-consulted and non-evidenced Transport Position Statement and the emerging updated Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils have reviewed Chapter 10 and are content that there is no reference to, or link suggested with, the Transport Position Statement of January 2025. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the Transport Position Statement is not capable of being a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

## **Representation 200370 (University of Cambridge)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

In relation to paragraph 10.20 (Vehicular Trip Budget) and the reference to “a financial penalty”, more clarity is needed on how these penalties are calculated and applied to provide certainty for those bringing developments forward.

### **Councils’ assessment**

Comments duly noted. The further clarity requested has been provided through additional text added to para 10.20.

## **Representation 200398 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 10.20 states that largescale developments subject to a vehicular trip budget should be monitored, and should the agreed forecast trips be exceeded, then a financial penalty, hold on future development, or a revised schedule of further transport or travel planning interventions, will likely be triggered. We consider that a financial penalty and hold on future development are extreme measures for failure to comply with a trip budget. Yes, more support for additional contributions for specific mitigations may be necessary and required but to unduly stop active development construction goes against the Central Government’s aim of delivering 300,000 homes per annum. Furthermore, it is also unclear how the financial penalty would be calculated it is not consistent with Regulation 122. and we request that the wording is deleted relating to a financial penalty and hold on development.

U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP consider there should not be a link between the non-consulted and non-evidenced Transport Position Statement and the emerging updated Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD.

### **Councils’ assessment**

Comments duly noted. Applicants will have needed to demonstrate that their proposed development was capable of compliance with the agreed trips as part of the grant of planning permission. Failure to then comply with the agreed trip budget will result in the development having unacceptable impacts on the highway network that are as a direct result of the development. Action must therefore be taken by the applicant/developer to remedy the breach – delays will prolong the unacceptable impacts. The financial penalty will likely reflect the level of breach, its impact and duration/persistence. It should be sufficient to ensure appropriate and immediate action is taken to remedy the breach.

A hold on development will likely be a last resort but may be necessary if the breach of the trip budget gives rise to significant safety concerns or unacceptable impact to the functioning of the wider highway network.

The Councils have reviewed Chapter 10 and are content that there is no reference to, or link suggested with, the Transport Position Statement of January 2025. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the Transport Position Statement is not capable of being a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.



## **Representation 200449 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

In terms of delivering essential water and sewerage infrastructure, most of our travel movements will be associated with the construction phase of the development. Whilst we note that this can have short term implications to transport and highways, we would seek to ensure that transport and highway obligations are reasonably and proportionately applied in the context of our investment projects, without leading to lengthy delays.

It is unclear from the Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Requirements, when such assessments would be required in terms of our own investment plans for infrastructure.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The travel movements required of Statutory Undertakers to deliver a development should have been accounted for by the applicant in the Transport Assessment of their proposal. They should be further accounted for in the agreed Construction Logistics Plan for the development.

## **Representation 200466 (Cambridgeshire County Council)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

In paragraphs 10.1 and 10.4 should these sections refer to strategic transport improvements?

In paragraph 10.13 it is agreed that there should be no lower threshold of development size.

Paragraph 10.19 is applicable for walking and cycling improvements also.

Paragraph 10.20 captures well how the County Council is using a vehicle trip budget.

In paragraph 10.24 the amount of contribution may be sought based on the cost of infrastructure and the trips generated, and or the quantum of the development linked to those trips. Contributions can also be based on a floor areas or numbers of dwellings of a development.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils consider that the details of the proposed strategic transport improvements are already set out in other, more relevant plans and strategies and do not need to be repeated in the Planning Obligations SPD.

The comment in support of there being no lower threshold is note and welcomed.

The Councils consider walking and cycling improvements to be captured by reference to improvements to active travel. However, this will be discussed further with County Transport to ensure this interpretation is shared and correct.

The comment in support of Paragraph 10.20 is noted.

While the Councils consider a floor area or dwelling could be used, this would still need to use the trips generated by a specific land use floorspace or by a dwelling as its basis.

### **Representation 200534 (British Horse Society)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The rights of way network forms part of the public highway infrastructure yet it is not even mentioned. There is also no reference to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

There is no recognition that equestrians are stated as equally vulnerable road users as cyclists in the Road User Hierarchy.

According to the Local Plan, Sustainable Travel includes the rights of way network and undertakes to protect and improve the amenity of these routes – that has to include for soft surface users not just walking and cycling. There is no indication of protection of this obligation within the SPD.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Reference to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan is included in Chapter 21 where the document deals specifically with public rights of way.

We will ensure that there are appropriate references to equestrians in recognition that the issue is referenced in local planning policy.

It should be noted that this SPD supplements the Local Plans; it not necessary to repeat all matters contained in the Local Plans within this SPD.

### **Representation 200575 (Carter Jonas on behalf of various named clients)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Regarding paragraph 10.20 it is requested that the wording relating financial penalties and imposing a hold on development is deleted.

Paragraph 10.24- There is a lack of transparency over how this cost will be calculated. In the case of one of the representors developments at Orchard Park, the County Council had to devise a bespoke calculation without any proper or rational policy basis or guidance. There is a need for more evidence around how these contributions will be sought.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils are content with the wording of Paragraph 10.20. The requirements associated with the implementation and monitoring of a development site's trip budget will require the securing of obligations within a s106 Agreement. This will include the methods of remedy should there be a failure to comply with the agreed trip budget.

Paragraph 10.24 seeks to provide clarity around the way contributions towards strategic transport improvements will be calculated. However, it is recognised that there are variables that can be more difficult to determine at any one point in time –

such as the likely final cost of a specific piece of strategic transport infrastructure – and therefore best estimates will likely need to be relied upon. Such matters are considered to form part of the negotiation of the final obligation requirements.

## **Chapter 11: Education**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 6

### **Representation 200287 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Query the necessity of this section of the SPD. The SPD does not provide any current information regarding the Council's assessment of existing or planned school capacity. The Chapter lacks the calculation information, which must be sourced from other documents and evidence.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The information regarding the assessment of capacity with schools and catchment areas, pupil multipliers and costs associated with new build and expansion projects change more regularly and more frequently than the SPD will be updated.

Therefore, the SPD sets out the principles for evaluating the impact of planning application and securing planning obligations whilst signposting to the County Council to provide the most current data and information.

### **Representation 200317 (Homes Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

HBF notes that the PPG and GOV.UK provided guidance on how residential development can support education. The HBF questions whether there is any need for this section of the SPD particularly as it doesn't actually contain the calculation information, and this has to be drawn from other documents and evidence. The SPD also doesn't contain any up-to-date information as to the Council's consideration of existing or planned school capacity.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The information regarding the assessment of capacity with schools and catchment areas, pupil multipliers and costs associated with new build and expansion projects change more regularly and more frequently than the SPD will be updated.

Therefore, the SPD sets out the principles for evaluating the impact of planning application and securing planning obligations whilst signposting to the County Council to provide the most current data and information.

## **Representation 200371 (University of Cambridge)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 11.9 states that child yield will be assessed against catchment capacities not school rolls – we are unclear on the distinction in this context. Further clarification is needed on the intended methodology.

To be in line with Government Guidance (Department for Education, June 2014. Building Bulletin 103: area guidelines for mainstream schools, pages 3 and 36), paragraph 11.14 should confirm that schools which divert from the standard site sizes may be considered on constrained sites or where other planning considerations need to be taken into account.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils considers that catchment forecasts, which show the school-age population living within an area, give a more accurate representation of the demand for local school places. This is because the pupil roll can be influenced by parental preference and the popularity of schools, which is subject to change.

Divergence from the guidance in Building Bulletin 103 will only be considered in exceptional and rare circumstances, and where the usual mitigations are not appropriate or possible. Such cases will be considered on their merits.

## **Representation 200399 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP) and Representation 200576 (Carter Jonas on behalf of various named clients)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

In paragraph 11.12 it states that "other contributions may be sought towards temporary accommodation or school travel."

This appears to be a "catch-all" clause and it has to be queried if this meets the reasonable tests within regulation 122. There needs to be evidence to support these potential obligations within the draft SPD.

.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. This paragraph flags that the use of temporary classroom or home to school travel costs could be considered as an alternative or in addition to providing additional permanent places at schools. However, it is recognised that such remedies will only be considered in exceptional and rare circumstances, and where the usual mitigations are not appropriate or possible. Such cases will necessarily need to be considered on their merits.

Paragraph 11.12 has been updated accordingly.

## **Representation 200587 (Cambridgeshire County Council)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Amend paragraph 11.8 so that reference to "County Council Children's Service Committee" is changed to "Children & Young People's Committee"

Amend paragraph 11.9 to add in the paragraph "has been estimated" instead of "is known".

Regarding paragraph 11.12, Some short-term solutions may be needed to meeting demand for school places, particularly in smaller rural communities where expanding or building new schools is not feasible. Therefore, the County Council supports the principle for securing contributions towards temporary accommodation and school transport and will prepare further guidance to support the SPD.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The suggested amendments to Paragraphs 11.8 and 11.9 are agreed and have been made.

An amendment has also been made to Paragraph 11.12 to clarify that the use of temporary solutions, such as temporary classroom and school travel would be considered in exceptional and rare circumstances.

## **Chapter 12: Public Art**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 8

### **Representation 200173 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The delivery of public art by developers has not been successful in Cambridge and has led to controversy. A better use of a financial contribution would be towards improved and new cultural venues to cater for the growing population of Cambridge.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The Councils consider public art provision to be a key element of place-making. However, as noted at paragraphs 12.15 and 12.16, public art is not restricted to installation works but could include provision of space or facilities to promote and enhance access to the arts.

### **Representation 200219 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust) and Representation 200423 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 12.7, final sentence to read "It further establishes the approach for determining the level of public art provision."

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The grammatical error at Paragraph 12.7 has now been corrected.

### **Representation 200288 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Chapter 12.6 suggests that the provision of Public Art could also be 'community-led'. This provides inconsistency with paragraph 12.14 which states (bold added by

Savills) *"Public art should be developed through a three-way partnership between the developer, an art consultant, and the Council and **involve consultation with the local community.**"* The Public Art SPD provides limited guidance on what level of 'consultation with the local community' is required. Further guidance as to the level of consultation expected would be welcomed."

Clarification is sought as to who is responsible for conducting the 'Public Art Audit'. The Public Art SPD states

*"A formal update of the audit is needed."* But does not provide clarity as to who will complete this update. Given the Council carried out the initial work it can be expected that they would carry out the update, clarification is asked for that, if this is not completed prior to an application being submitted, is the applicant then expected to complete this work.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The expectation is that the commissioning of new public artworks should involve the local community. The Councils do not consider there to be inconsistency with the wording of paragraphs 12.6 and 12.14, rather they provide the range of engagement with the local community from meaningful consultation on a proposal to the proposal being 'community-led'. The approach to be taken should be tailored to an individual development, having regard to the requirement that provision be integrated into the overall design of the development, and with consideration to the nature and scope of the art provision, its function, form, prominence etc. As such, the Councils do not consider it appropriate or necessary that this be prescribe in guidance. The Councils preference is that public art provision, including proposals for local community involvement, is considered in the context of pre-application discussion.

Paragraph 12.17 has been updated to confirm that it is the Councils public art audit.

## **Representation 200352 (Jaynic)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Jaynic query the necessity of the additional work involved in the application concerning the provision of a Public Art Strategy followed by a Public Art Delivery Plan, especially as the SPD already stipulates that the provision of public art should be a three-way partnership between the developer, an art consultant, and the Council, in consultation with the local community.

Given the nature of the types of development Jaynic undertake from a commercial perspective, whilst it is acknowledged that future employees of future occupiers can enjoy the enhanced urban realm due to the public art installations, we query whether provision should be made for public art to be provided in a more public setting in proximity to a development site, particularly where the end development might be a commercial/business park, or industrial site.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. As set out at Paragraph 12.9, the requirement for both a Public Art Strategy and a Public Art Delivery Plan would only apply to applications for outline planning permission. This is to ensure there is an overarching strategy for the development as a whole that is agreed at outline, with the detail of its implementation

dealt with through the Public Art Delivery Plan for subsequent reserve matters applications. This recognises that the delivery of the arts strategy for large development sites will necessarily need to be delivered in phases across the build out period of the development.

The Councils consider that the Planning Obligations SPD already provides the flexibility sought – significant flexibility is provided to consider the form of public art provision within a development proposal, including its location. As the overarching objective of the policy requirement is for the artwork to be appreciated by the public, the SPD recognises that there may be circumstances where this may be difficult to achieve onsite and, therefore, provides for a cascade to offsite provision or a commuted sum where these would better meet the policy objective.

### **Representation 200400 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Regarding paragraph 12.12. U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP support the principle that a 1% public art value is not appropriate for setting budgets on large major sites as public art budgets for these types of sites should be determined on a site specific and wider-geographic basis. U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP do not agree that the starting point should be 1% as this is unrealistic on such large major sites. The contribution does not meet the Regulation 122 test as being necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and is not directly related to the development, therefore it cannot be considered reasonable. We therefore request for this requirement to be deleted.

Paragraph 12.4. Wording should be amended to allow the budget to be included within the Public Art Delivery Plan. As on some large major sites it may not be possible to agree a public art budget for inclusion within the s106 agreement.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. As set out in the Planning Obligations SPD, the Councils consider public art provision to be a key element of placemaking. The Councils are firmly of the opinion that the investment in quality placemaking secures development value over its lifetime. In this context, and the fact that public art provision can and should be integrated into the overall design of buildings and spaces and can take a multitude of different forms and functions – 1% of build cost is considered a reasonable starting point for negotiation and compliant with the statutory tests being directly related to the development, reasonable in scale and kind to the development, and necessary for the development to demonstrate its contribution to placemaking.

The Councils consider that the public art budget should be considered at the same time and alongside other high-level obligations, and their costs, are considered, negotiated and agreed. Consideration could be given to including a review mechanism or similar to be included within the S106 agreement that would allow budgets to be adjusted / refined through the Public Art Delivery Plan for each phase of development.



## **Representation 200450 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

We would seek to understand whether major infrastructure projects, such as those related to essential utility provision, should be subject to public art requirements. Statutory utility companies are only mentioned within the South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide in the context of technical consultations related to the installation of public artwork.

It is acknowledged that decisions on the exemption of public art requirements for specific developments will be assessed case-by-case. We welcome additional clarification to confirm public art obligations would be limited to major residential developments.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Where a major utilities infrastructure project results in impacts, such as landscape, visual, or amenity impacts, it would be reasonable to consider the role of public art in providing mitigation. The ability to integrate public art into the design of the utility structure, including issues of cost and implications on functionality and maintenance requirements, would need to be considered and assessed on a case-by-case basis.

## **Representation 200577 (Carter Jonas on behalf of various named clients)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Regarding Paragraph 12.12, the principle that a 1% public art value is not appropriate for setting budgets on large major sites is supported. It is not considered that such a contribution would, in any event, meet the Regulation 122 test as being necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and is not directly related to the development, therefore it cannot be considered reasonable. Furthermore, it is not possible to tell how the 1% gross development cost has been calculated therefore this fails the Regulation 122 test of being reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. As set out in the draft Planning Obligations SPD, the Councils consider public art provision to be a key element of placemaking. The Councils are firmly of the opinion that the investment in quality placemaking secures development value over its lifetime. In this context, and the fact that public art provision can and should be integrated into the overall design of buildings and spaces and can take a multitude of different forms and functions – 1% of build cost is considered a reasonable starting point for negotiation and compliant with the statutory tests being directly related to the development, reasonable in scale and kind to the development, and necessary for the development to demonstrate its contribution to placemaking.

## **Chapter 13: Burial Space**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 9

## **Representation 200578 (Carter Jonas on behalf of named clients) and Representation 200401 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

Regarding Paragraph 13.7, it is queried how the threshold of 200 dwellings was arrived at as it seems low.

In Paragraph 13.11 it provides the burial sites contributions by dwellings size, it is queried how these dwellings by size have been formulated and what evidence was used to calculate the cost. This needs to be fully evidenced as required by Regulation 122.

### **Councils' assessment**

The threshold of 200 dwellings or more is set out in Policy CS/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

The layout cost of £100,000 represents a figure of around half of the cost of Informal Open Space (see Infrastructure Costing Review – Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD July 2025) and which has been benchmarked against the cost of new burial spaces provided in South Cambridgeshire.

An anomaly has been discovered with the calculations following publication of the SPD and the contributions will be corrected ahead of prior to re-consulting on the draft SPD.

## **Representation 200276 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

This contribution is inappropriate in all regards. There can be no direct correlation between new development and burials: for instance it is very possible that burials would take place in other locations - i.e. alongside other family members. The requirement to deliver new burial grounds within large new strategic locations is supported. Adding yet a further contribution to small housing schemes is inappropriate. The correlation between the figures is not clear particularly given the likely percentage of cremation

### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils consider that where new development places pressures on existing facilities and services, such that additional provision is required to meet need, then the new development should be required to contribute to meeting such need. This extends to the provision of new burial space. Developers are expected to contribute towards just the land cost of providing burial space. The contributions have been decreased for reasons set out above.

## **Representation 200289 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

There are no policy requirements within the Local Plan or available in adopted SPD to provide a reasonable argument for such contribution requests to Burial Space on all residential development. Savills comment that a threshold should be in place in which an assessment for sites is necessary as listed in South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Policy SC/4. This should be based upon demonstrable evidence. Within the Cambridge Local Plan (Policy 85) there is no reference to Burial Space, therefore as a 'policy requirement' this has not been tested at public examination as required by the NPPF and PPG as previously stated.

### **Councils' assessment**

As set out in Paragraph 13.4 of the SPD, Policy SC/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan provides the policy requirement. Part 4 of the policy lists the community facilities and services to be provided, with provision for burials specifically listed at bullet point h.

The threshold of 200 dwellings or more is also set out in Policy SC/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

Para 13.10 advises that contributions towards burial space will only be sought where a need is identified.

The Councils agree there is no equivalent policy requirement for Cambridge City. The Planning Obligations SPD only sought to require provision for burial spaces from development within South Cambridgeshire, however this may not have been explicit in the previous draft. Paragraph 13.5 has been amended to clarify this.

## **Representation 200318 (Homes Builders Federation)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD suggests that planning obligations will be sought from residential development. It suggests that proposals for over 200 dwellings should be accompanied by assessments of need and strategies regarding how the need will be addressed. It also provides a contribution to cost per dwelling based on number of bedrooms, these range from £139.26 for a 1-bed dwelling to £369.10 for a 4+bed dwelling.

The HBF is concerned that the viability of these costs has not been considered, and whilst the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan includes a reference to burial space the same cannot be said for Cambridge Local Plan, therefore this policy requirement has not been tested and examined in public as required by the NPPF and PPG.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Contributions for burial space relates only to South Cambridgeshire District Council. Paragraph 13.5 has been amended to clarify this. The contributions have been decreased for reasons set out above.

## **Representation 200361 (Turley on behalf of Vistry Strategic Land)**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD sets out the amount of burial space per dwelling:

While there is some evidence presented to support this, the Constitutional Affairs Select Committee Eighth Report 2006 cited is somewhat dated and the Councils should consider whether there is any up-to-date evidence to support the figures stated. In addition, there is no evidence to support the stated statistic that each hectare of a cemetery can accommodate around 3000 burial plots. Therefore, while we do not object to the principle of the obligation itself, the amount of space identified needs to be evidenced.

In terms of contributions, the SPD proposes that smaller developments should provide a contribution where a need is identified in consultation with the Parish Council. Paragraph 13.11 states:

The cost of acquiring new land for burials is around £240,000 per hectare and the cost of preparing that land for burials is £100,000 per hectare meaning a contribution of £34 per m<sup>2</sup> of burial space or £113.22 per each plot.

The Councils should clarify the evidence underpinning these estimated costs and whether there is a cost difference between the two authority areas.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils are unaware of any more up to date evidence that the Constitutional Affairs Select Committee Eighth Report 2006 which highlights that only 30% of deaths now result in a burial. The Government published its [Low environmental risk cemeteries: exemption conditions](#) in October 2023, that states that the burial density of a new cemetery or new extension must not be greater than 2,500 burials per hectare. However, this threshold is to avoid the need to apply for an environmental permit. Given the land value in Cambridge and the need to ensure land is used efficiently, the Councils consider that burial density of 3,000 burial plots is more appropriate in the local context. If the density is lowered to 2,500, as recommended by Government guidance, this would simply mean that developers are expected to contribute more.

An anomaly has been discovered with the calculations following publication of the SPD and the contributions have been amended.

Contributions for burial space relates only to South Cambridgeshire District Council. Paragraph 13.5 has been amended to clarify this.

## **Representation 200460 (Tor & Co on behalf of Hill Residential Ltd (Hill))**

### **Main issues raised in representation**

The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) Policy SC/4 'Meeting Community Needs' includes provision for burials in the list of services and facilities to be provided, however there is no table or level of contributions / requirements set out within policy. In contrast, the draft SPD sets out requirements and contributions

which were not tested as part of the Local Plan process. This could undermine the deliverability of the Local Plan, potentially impacting the ability for allocated sites to deliver policy compliant viable schemes, in conflict with paragraph 34 of the NPPF.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The SPD is supplementary guidance to the policy. The SPD establishes that 0.1 ha burial space is required per 1,000 people (equivalent to 1 m<sup>2</sup> per capita). This is a modest additional policy requirement when compared to other space requirements set out in the Local Plan which require a combined 3.2 ha per 1,000 people.

### **Representation 200461 (Tor & Co on behalf of Hill Residential Ltd (Hill))**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 13.8- It identifies that 1ha of cemetery can accommodate around 3,000 burial plots (3.33m<sup>2</sup> required per plot). The SPD is not clear if one plot equates to one individual or if there could feasibly be several individuals within the one plot (cremations assumed). The table (following paragraph 13.9) setting out the burial space required per dwelling size, appears to be referencing the average occupancy per dwelling size (as set out in Appendix A), thus suggesting that 1 person requires 1m<sup>2</sup>. This does not seem correct in the context of the information presented in paragraphs 13.8 and 13.11 and the table following paragraph 13.11 which sets out the contributions by dwellings size.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. For clarity, developers are expected to contribute towards just the land cost of providing burial space. As set out at Paragraph 13.9, this equates to c.0.1ha per 1,000 people, taking into account the ratio of cremations to burials.

An anomaly has been discovered with the calculations following previous publication of the SPD and the contributions have now been corrected.

### **Representation 200462 (Tor & Co on behalf of Hill Residential Ltd (Hill))**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) Policy SC/4, that in reflecting Planning Practice Guidance, the Council does not seek tariff style Section 106 contributions for general off site infrastructure improvements from sites under 10 dwellings (and which have a combined gross floor space of no more than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>). Many of the obligations set out in the draft SPD that relate to general off site infrastructure improvements set out, in some instances, that obligations will be sought from all residential developments, regardless of size. This should be reviewed and amended in line with the adopted local plan and the PPG.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The SPD has been amended to clarify that contributions for burial space will be sought from major residential developments (i.e. of 10 dwellings or more than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>) within South Cambridgeshire.

## **Chapter 14: Public Open Space**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 11

### **Representation 200290 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Further clarification is required as to which parts this SPD are superseded by the South Cambridgeshire Open Space in New Developments SPD.

Further details are needed regarding the requirements for a submitted sports strategy for developers of large windfall sites not accounted for in the Greater Cambridge Playing Pitch Strategy. The Greater Cambridge Playing Pitch Strategy does not provide said detailed guidance for developers.

In paragraph 14.19 it should read "Figure 10 of the Local Plan provides guidance on when different types of plays space should be provided onsite.

Paragraph 14.32 describes commuted maintenance fees "where the circumstances of a particular site require a contribution calculated on a longer period where there is sufficient justification." Any contribution needs to be justified by supporting evidence provided within a Public Open Space Study or Open Space SPD.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Amendments will be made to clarify the elements of the previous SPD which have been superseded.

The grammatical error in Paragraph 14.19 has been corrected.

### **Representation 200294 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The contributions should apply to major housing developments only. The scale of the contributions for minor housing developments will be significant and is likely to deter development from taking place. The scale of the contributions would severely impact the viability of new developments and, for those schemes that do proceed, would be likely to increase the sale or rental costs.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Whilst both Local Plans require all residential developments to contribute towards open space to meet the need generated by the development,

reflecting Planning Practice Guidance, the Councils will not typically seek tariff style Section 106 contributions for general off site infrastructure improvements from sites under 10 dwellings (and which have a combined gross floor space of no more than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>).

### **Representation 200319 (Homes Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

This SPD suggests that obligations will be sought from residential developments, it sets out the costs by dwelling size including capital costs and maintenance costs, these are slightly different for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

The home building industry are used to providing public open space as part of development or as contributions where appropriate. However, it will be important to ensure that these requirements are viable and deliverable and do not prevent or stall delivery of homes.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Where the Councils independent viability assessors confirm that a development is unable to satisfy all planning policy requirements the Council may look to reduce contributions below that which are set out in the SPD.

### **Representation 200343 (Sport England)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 14.16 of the SPD outlines that the provision of on-site outdoor playing pitches should be made with regard to the most recently adopted Greater Cambridge Playing Pitch Strategy. Consequently, the SPD would fail to accord with paragraph 103 of the NPPF because the SPD would not be 'based on robust and up-to-date assessment of the need for... sport... and opportunities for new provision.

Sport England suggests that text should be incorporated under the subheading for outdoor sports, similar to the guidance provided for indoor sports in paragraph 15.10, informing applicants that an updated Playing Pitch Strategy is set to be adopted in due course.

In terms of on-site provision, an estimate of the demand generated for outdoor sports provision can be provided by Sport England's Playing Pitch Calculator strategic planning tool. Sport England therefore recommends text is included under the subheading outdoor sports facilities, advising that a Playing Pitch Strategy is due to be adopted, and the data within those documents should be inputted into Sport England's calculators to determine onsite/offsite contributions. In addition, Sport England calculate facility costs quarterly using estimates of what it typically costs to build sport facilities, (<https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/facility-cost-guidance>)

In terms of off-site provision, it is unclear how the capital costs in the SPD have been calculated. A footnote, or explanation, should be provided to ensure it is transparent and clear how these calculations have been equated. Sport England recommends our Playing Pitch Calculator is used to calculate costs based on an updated Playing Pitch Strategy.



### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils prepared a playing pitch strategy to accompany the adopted local plans. An updated study is now underway to inform the Greater Cambridge Local Plan, with much of the stakeholder engagement stage complete. When the new study is complete and published that can be taken into account as evidence in planning decisions. An amendment to highlight that a new study has been made.

The requirements set out in the SPD reflect those in the adopted local plans. The costs have been updated to provide a robust and up to date cost provision to inform planning obligations. Sport England facilities information was considered when developing those costs. Further information on the development of costs can be found in the Infrastructure Costing Review – Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD July 2025, which has been now published.

### **Representation 200353 (Jaynic)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Jaynic are of the opinion that the SPD is not explicit enough when stating that it is only informal open space being sought on commercial development. Commercial does not feature as an exemption in the relevant categories. In addition, there are no quantified tables showing the amount of contribution required for a commercial developer. Furthermore, the range of developments which fall under the category of commercial are vast and therefore, whilst informal open space on a city centre scheme under class E might be suitable, an industrial estate might be less suitable. In these less suitable developments, open space should be focussed more on the sustainable green linkages which provide access to services and facilities for the employees of the occupiers.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The SPD highlights that large scale commercial developments will be required to consider how the needs of their workers and visitors will be met for social and leisure facilities. This is to ensure that the impacts of developments are fully considered. Specific cost breakdown is not provided as the impacts and appropriate responses to them are likely to be on case-by-case basis. Any planning obligations that result would need to meet the CIL regulations in terms of being necessary and proportionate.

### **Representation 200362 (Turley on behalf of Vistry Strategic Land )**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

It is acknowledged that both Local Plans set out requirements for either the provision of on-site public open space, or an equivalent off-site contribution. It is also noted that the SPD does provide a detailed breakdown of costs and different costs per authority have been set out. However, the capital costs set out need to be evidenced and viability tested by the authorities.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The review undertaken of specific infrastructure costs will be published for consultation alongside re-consultation on the updated draft of the SPD in Summer 2025.

The extant policy requirements within both Local Plans, including the open space requirements, were the subject of viability assessment. There is no evidence to suggest that the conclusions reached in the original viability assessments needs revisiting. Rather, more recent viability benchmarking ([see paper](#)), undertaken in support of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals, continues to clearly demonstrate that development across Greater Cambridge remains viable even with the higher and additional policy requirements being proposed through the emerging Local Plan.

### **Representation 200372 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Whilst paragraph 14.41 is helpful in establishing the principle that some types of home have different child yields/population profiles, we consider the text should go further to include a general principle that provision for children in particular can be adjusted if the specialist nature of the housing indicates a significantly lower child yield per bedroom is likely.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Planning obligations are required to mitigate the impact of the development only and so if it is demonstrated that a development will create a lower child yield, then the level of contribution will reflect that. No additional text is considered necessary here as this general principle is applicable to all Chapters.

### **Representation 200402 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 14.14 states that the Cambridge Local Plan requires 1.2 hectares per 1,000 people of playing pitches, courts and greens. Appendix I states that this is an amalgamation of standards for different sports, based on team generation rates and current provision, and provides guidance regarding how this should be addressed. It is recommended that wording is inserted to clarify that greater flexibility should be given to significant large previously developed sites in the urban context that are subject to the Area Action Plan.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Cambridge Local Plan 2018 appendix I provides further guidance regarding when on site or off site would be sought. All development proposals are considered on their merits.

### **Representation 200445 (Mr Howard Felstead)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Regarding Paragraph 14.27 a requirement to transfer land to a particular public body like the Parish Council is likely to contravene Regulation 122. There are generally many different options available to secure the proper long-term management and maintenance of open space or other facilities. The Parish Council or Town Council etc have a part to play but a rigid policy of insisting that a Parish Council or Town Council be the first resort as management body is unlikely to be necessary to make

a proposed development acceptable in planning terms. This 'strong advice' should be removed.

#### **Councils' assessment**

The wording "strongly advised" is consistent with para 2.20 of the South Cambridgeshire Open space in new developments Supplementary Planning Document 2009. Since it has been the practice of South Cambridgeshire for Parish Councils to have first refusal for open space adoption whilst recognising that in many cases open space will be transferred to Management Companies. This approach has been broadly accepted by the development industry and it is not agreed that there is any contravention of CIL Regulation 122.

#### **Representation 200455 (Urban & Civic)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD should also set out a clear process on how development proposals which are unable to provide on-site nature/wildlife mitigation can provide meaningful off-site mitigation in line with the vision for the forthcoming Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

We would like to take this opportunity to encourage GCSP to support Natural Cambridgeshire, the County Council, and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority in progressing forthcoming Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils are engaging with the Combined Authority on the development of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. The Councils also have an adopted Biodiversity SPD.

#### **Representation 200463 (Tor & Co on behalf of Hills Residential Ltd (Hill))**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

It would be useful to include an explanation of the different 'capital costs' (cost per m<sup>2</sup>) of open space land uses in the two areas as it is surprising that the capital cost per m<sup>2</sup> is so different between them. It is also noted that the 'capital costs' section of the SPD does not include the land value, and this is considered separately. This is a different approach from the adopted South Cambridgeshire Open Space SPD where the capital payments of off-site contributions appear to include the land value in the 'per person' cost.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Additional background on the costs has been published.

### **Chapter 15: Indoor Sports, including Swimming**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 11

#### **Representation 200213 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

It would be useful to provide a definition of commercial developments so that NHS clinical development with ancillary commercial components are not unintentionally

captured or treated in the same way as offices or research and development facilities.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The principle is that staff working in Cambridge will use local indoor sports and swimming facilities and therefore all commercial developments should contribute towards provision. While it is recognised that the NHS is a publicly funded body, the NHS is a large employer and its staff will use local sports facilities to meet their recreational needs. Therefore, developments proposed by the NHS should comply with para 15.5.

#### **Representation 200220 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 15.6, final sentence to read "This strategy will be kept up to date and provision should take account of the most up to date version."

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Paragraph 15.6 has been amended.

#### **Representation 200291 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

Would emphasise that the Council should ensure that the requirements set out in Chapter 15 are viable and deliverable. Any requirements that could prevent the delivery of homes should be avoided.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The principle is that staff working in Cambridge will use local indoor sports and swimming facilities and therefore all commercial developments should contribute towards provision. While it is recognised that the NHS is a publicly funded body, the NHS is a large employer and its staff will use local sports facilities to meet their recreational needs. Therefore, developments proposed by the NHS should comply with para 15.5.

As set out at Paragraph 2.49, if an applicant considers the financial ask of all obligations required of a specific development proposal will place the development at risk of being unviable, if supported by evidence and agreed by the LPA, a tailored approach will be considered to ensure this risk is appropriately managed.

#### **Representation 200301 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

These contributions appear to be a 'double dip' as the home occupier then has to pay to use the new or improved facilities. These facilities are commercial enterprises as it is not a developer's fault if the facility has not been improved or extended. There may be some justification for contributions from larger strategic scale schemes. This would further jeopardise small and medium scale developments.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. All scales of development have the potential to create additional burdens on local facilities. It is not unreasonable to expect those impacts

to be considered, identified and where appropriate mitigated. The scale of development proposed where these issues should be considered is considered reasonable and appropriate.

### **Representation 200320 (Home Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

This section is based on Cambridge Local Plan Policy 68 and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Policy SC/4. This SPD suggests that planning obligations will be sought from all residential development, it suggests that on-site provision is only likely to be required in the largest forms of development. Off-site contributions will be guided by the Sports England Facilities Calculator, and the SPD sets out a contribution per house based on the number of bedrooms, with slightly differing costs in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire but ranging from £276.75 to £769.36 for swimming contributions and £227.55 to £726.98 for Indoors Sports Hall contributions.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted.

### **Representation 200344 (Sport England)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Indoor sports facilities are sought based on a standards approach of which Sport England are not supportive of for the reasons explained above for indoor sports. The standards set out within the SPD are reflective of those within the Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

Sport England welcomes the inclusion of paragraph 15.10. Sport England advises that the following text, highlighted in red below, should be added as a caveat following paragraph 15.15.

‘The costs of contributions are guided by the Sport England Facilities Calculator and may be subject to change’.

Sport England advises that the draft Playing Pitch Strategy and Built Facility Strategy should be completed and formally adopted, ideally before the publication of the SPD.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The SPDs reflect the policies and approaches set out in the adopted Local Plans. This is the correct approach for an SPD which supplements those plans.

The amendment to text following 15.15 is a useful suggestion and has now been added. See paragraph 15.16.

The adopted Local Plans reference the current playing pitch and indoor facilities strategies. New studies are underway to support the new local plan, but these have yet to be completed and published.

### **Representation 200354 (Jaynic)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Jaynic maintain that whilst some informal outdoor space should be provided for in commercial developments, green linkages to services and facilities are more significant for employees and should be counted in the requirement, the adopted policy does not require commercial developments to contribute to indoor sports facilities and there Jaynic object's to commercial developments being required to do so, particularly when residential development is already providing such contributions. The SPD needs to be clarified further, and exemptions made clear. If the Council do want to keep the inclusion of commercial, they should have a table quantifying the requirements.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Paragraph 15.5 of the draft SPD states that 'Large scale commercial developments (above 5000m2) will be required to consider how the needs of their workers and visitors will be met for social and leisure facilities. If the need cannot be met through existing or additional onsite facilities this could mean off site contributions to address the impact on facilities is necessary and will be sought.' It is not unreasonable to require a large development to address the impact of the development and is capable of meeting the tests in CIL regulations.

### **Representation 200363 (Turley on behalf of Vistry Strategic Land)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

In terms of off-site contributions, the SPD does provide different levels of contribution per authority area and cites the Sport England Facilities Calculator in estimating the costs of a contribution. However, we highlight that the figures quoted need to be viability tested.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The extant policy requirements within both Local Plans, including the requirements for indoor sports and swimming provision, were the subject of viability assessment. There is no evidence to suggest that the conclusions reached in the original viability assessments needs revisiting. Rather, more recent viability benchmarking ([see paper](#)), undertaken in support of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals, continues to clearly demonstrate that development across Greater Cambridge remains viable even with the higher and additional policy requirements being proposed through the emerging Local Plan.

### **Representation 200403 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 15.14 states that at the time of publication, the Sport England Facilities Calculator requires £236 for swimming pool provision from each new person. The Cambridge swimming contribution per dwelling size.

Paragraph 15.12 states that projects will be identified in consultation with service providers. It is therefore unclear how a blanket payment per person or per dwelling

correlates to funding a specific project. A contribution should be directly linked and calculated for a specific project as per the Regulation 122 tests.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Contributions will be directly linked to projects. However, the Sport England calculator provides a fair and robust method of identifying a reasonable contribution per person when a facility will potentially serve a population of thousands and cost potentially millions of pounds to deliver.

### **Representation 200417 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

It would be useful to provide a definition of commercial developments so that NHS clinical development with ancillary commercial components are not unintentionally captured or treated in the same way as offices or research and development facilities.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The principle is that staff working in Cambridge will use local indoor sports and swimming facilities and therefore all commercial developments should contribute towards provision. While it is recognised that the NHS is a publicly funded body, the NHS is a large employer and its staff will use local sports facilities to meet their recreational needs. Therefore, developments proposed by the NHS should comply with para 15.5.

### **Representation 200424 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 15.6, final sentence to read "This strategy will be kept up to date and provision should take account of the most up to date version."

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Paragraph 15.6 now incorporates suggested wording.

## **Chapter 16: Public Realm**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 3

### **Representation 200292 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

No comment in relation to Chapter 16 of the SPD.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted.



### **Representation 200321 (Home Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD suggests that planning obligations will be sought from all development, and that S106 agreements could be used for a variety of on-site and off-site public realm improvements.

The HBF considers that most public realm measures will be provided as the new residential development is provided and it is considered unlikely that further provision should be considered necessary. It is also considered that the Council should be working closely with the development industry to ensure that these public realm schemes are adopted and therefore there should not be any ongoing maintenance costs for these measures. Therefore, the HBF considers that this section of the SPD should be deleted.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted but disagree. There are a range of circumstances where a planning obligation could be required to address the needs generated by development or the policy requirements of the local plans regarding public realm.

It is acknowledged though that paragraph 16.5 could be interpreted that a s106 will be required for public realm matters on every development, which is not the case. Paragraph 16.5 has therefore been amended.

### **Representation 200533 (British Horse Society)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

There is nothing in this SPD to encourage rurality into public realm design nor access to the countryside. There is an opportunity within the rights of way section to include the need for a rural peripheral restricted byway around developments and enhance the opportunities for residents. In fact, this is an opportunity for Cambridgeshire to create a policy to ensure that this happens. That concept is already supported by the Cambs ROWIP and NPPF 104.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. These are matters best addressed though the Local Plan or design guidance rather than this SPD.

## **Chapter 17: Waste and Recycling**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 3

### **Representation 200293 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Savills proposes the following change to Paragraph 17.16 for grammatical purposes:

*Developers will be required to pay the ~~different~~ difference between the average cost of an electric vehicle and a diesel; vehicle which is £112 per unit."*

Clarity as to how the figure of £112 per unit has been reached. Savills want to emphasise that the Council should ensure that the requirements set out in Chapter 17 are viable and deliverable.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. A correction to the final sentence in paragraph 17.16 has been made.

The SPD requires developers to mitigate their impact including the additional burden placed upon the Council in relation to household waste collection. This includes the provision of new refuse collection vehicles and bins required to serve new developments, with the new refuse collection vehicles being electric.

### **Representation 200322 (Home Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD suggests that planning obligations will be sought from all development, and that there is a cost to issue bins for new properties (£90 per dwelling), a cost in relation to the provision of refuse collection vehicles (£112 per dwelling) and a cost in relation to the provision of household recycling centres.

The HBF considers that it will be important to ensure that these requirements are viable and deliverable and do not prevent or stall delivery of homes.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The extant policy requirements within both Local Plans, including waste servicing needs, were the subject of viability assessment. There is no evidence to suggest that the conclusions reached in the original viability assessments needs revisiting. Rather, more recent viability benchmarking ([see paper](#)), undertaken in support of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals, continues to clearly demonstrate that development across Greater Cambridge remains viable even with the higher and additional policy requirements being proposed through the emerging Local Plan.

### **Representation 200373 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The figures within paragraphs 17.15 and 17.16 need to be double checked. The difference between £114 and £80 is £64, not the £112 quoted. Also, it should be confirmed if this is a one-off payment. Finally, clarity should also be provided as to how this applies where an underground bin system is in place.

The contributions set out in paragraph 17.21 in relation to Household Recycling Centres requires further definition as to the basis for any financial contributions and what these amounts could be.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The contribution represents the difference in cost in providing a diesel and an electric refuse collection vehicle which is £144 per dwelling.

This is a one-off payment.

Where an underground bin system is proposed the household waste contribution will reflect the ongoing servicing of this on a case-by-case basis.

Paragraph 17.21 clarifies that the Cambridgeshire County Council will assess the demands a proposed development will have on existing household recycling centres.

## **Chapter 18: Emergency Services**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 11

### **Representation 200214 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust), 200418 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The recognition in Paragraph 18.1 that “new developments place new requirements for emergency services” is welcomed; however, the second sentence in the paragraph should be reworded to read “Developers will be required to mitigate this impact to make a development acceptable.” The above change would remove any ambiguity as to whether a development is required to mitigate its impact on emergency service provision.

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. The introduction has been amended and addresses the comment.

### **Representation 200215 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust) and Representation 200419 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraphs 18.5, 18.6 and 18.7 and the form in which contributions should be made contained therein are welcomed and supported.

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted.

### **Representation 200295 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

No comment in relation to Chapter 18 of the SPD.

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted.

### **Representation 200302 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Please consider two High Court decisions were The University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust, R (On the Application Of) v Harborough District Council [2023] EWHC 263 (Admin) (“the Leicester NHS Trust”) and Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust, R (On the Application Of) v Malvern Hills District Council & Ors [2023] EWHC

1995 (Admin) ("the Worcestershire NHS Trust"). Both suggest that NHS S106 contributions are not lawful.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. In producing the SPD the Councils have had regard to the High Court decisions quoted and, consistent with the Judgements, confirms that contributions will only be secured if the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust demonstrate to the satisfaction of the decision taker that the existing infrastructure cannot meet the needs of the development and further that a project has been identified against which contributions would be used.

### **Representation 200323 (Homes Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

This section of the SPD is based on Cambridge Local Plan Policy 85 and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan TI/8. The SPD suggests that planning obligations will be sought from all development, and that contributions will be dependent on the size and scale of the proposal. The HBF would query what evidence the Council have to support this proposal for funding for the emergency services, is there evidence of a capacity issue or a funding gap created by new development in the area.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Each of the emergency services have confirmed that they are operating at capacity and that new development is likely to place these services under unacceptable strain. Whether contributions are secured is dependent on each of the services demonstrating on a case-by-case basis to the satisfaction of the decision taker that the existing infrastructure cannot meet the needs of the development and further that a project has been identified against which contributions would be used to mitigate the impact.

### **Representation 200341 (Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

"Insufficient recognition is given to the role of Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service as an 'essential social infrastructure' provider who contributes to the creation of sustainable new communities;

Insufficient detail is provided on the scope of developer funded infrastructure & facilities provision required to mitigate & manage the impacts of planned housing & population growth on the service capacity of the Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service;

Updated text is requested for Chapter 18- please see separate/related representations as part of the 'joint blue light' submission."

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The SPD recognises the importance of ensuring that all developments mitigate their impact and states that infrastructure for emergency services and infrastructure for supporting the police service may be required on-site and that off-site contributions may be sought as part of the planning process on a site-by-site basis where the impact mitigation is necessary.

The Councils welcome the suggested wording contained in the submission titled 'Joint Blue Light Partner Representations' and have made amendments incorporating much of this wording into the SPD.

### **Representation 200379 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The chapter is too vague with respect to the nature and scale of potential contributions. For very large scale development physical provision of infrastructure, such as ambulance or fire stations may meet the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) Regulation 122 tests (where a costed project plan is provided) but the general funding of emergency services (requests for revenue funding of any type, or, for example, police cars/uniforms) are not acceptable uses of planning obligations. This text needs to be revisited.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Whether contributions are secured is dependent on each service demonstrating on a case-by-case basis to the satisfaction of the decision taker that the existing infrastructure cannot meet the needs of the development and further that a project has been identified against which contributions would be used to mitigate the impact.

### **Representation 200446 (Mr Howard Felstead)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The Councils will need to demonstrate how these obligations satisfy Regulation 122 with particular regard to the judgement in R (on the application of the University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust) v Harborough District Council (2023). The SPD should make explicit reference to the need for a Regulation 122 compliance assessment.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Whether contributions are secured is dependent on each service demonstrating on a case-by-case basis to the satisfaction of the decision taker that the existing infrastructure cannot meet the needs of the development and further that a project has been identified against which contributions would be used to mitigate the impact.

### **Representation 200579 (Carter Jonas on behalf of various named clients)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Regarding Paragraph 18.5, the draft SPD is vague on how contributions will be sought and this should be made much clearer. As written, it is queried if the SPD meets the statutory tests. Unless the wording can be strengthened, the requirement should be deleted.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Whether contributions are secured is dependent on the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust demonstrating on a case-by-case basis to the satisfaction of the decision taker that the existing infrastructure cannot meet the

needs of the development and further that a project has been identified against which contributions would be used.

## **Chapter 19: Planning Obligations to Support Local Employment and Skills**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 6

### **Representation 200296 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The scale of residential and commercial development should be stated in Paragraph 19.4. it is stated in Paragraph 19.5. For consistency with other chapters, it should be stated in Paragraph 19.4.

Savills would like to express concern that no policies in both the Cambridge Local Plan and the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan express a requirements for this. As stated previously it is inappropriate for plan-makers to establish new formulaic approaches to planning obligations in supplementary planning documents or supporting evidence base documents, as these would not undergo examination.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Additional clarification is proposed has been added on the scale of development to paragraph 19.4.

The draft SPD acknowledges that skill plans are not specifically required by the local plans, but the SPD encourages their provision, and provides a mechanism that can be applied if they are included as part of a S106 agreement.

### **Representation 200324 (Home Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD suggests that planning obligations will be sought from all residential development, with major developments encouraged to contribute towards the provision of skills and employment opportunities for local residents through the provision and implementation of an Employment and Skills Plan.

The HBF is concerned that there are no policies in either Plan in relation to this requirement, and therefore, this is not in line with the NPPF or the PPG. The HBF is also concerned that this means that this requirement has not been tested at examination and the impact of this requirement on the delivery of development has not been considered. The HBF considers that it is also unlikely that the impacts of this requirement have been considered in terms of viability.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The draft SPD acknowledges that skill plans are not specifically required by the local plans, but the SPD encourages their provision, and provides a mechanism that can be applied if they are included as part of a S106 agreement.

### **Representation 200355 (Jaynic)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD suggests that planning obligations will be sought from all residential development, with major developments encouraged to contribute towards the provision of skills and employment opportunities for local residents through the provision and implementation of an Employment and Skills Plan.

The HBF is concerned that there are no policies in either Plan in relation to this requirement, and therefore, this is not in line with the NPPF or the PPG. The HBF is also concerned that this means that this requirement has not been tested at examination and the impact of this requirement on the delivery of development has not been considered. The HBF considers that it is also unlikely that the impacts of this requirement have been considered in terms of viability.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Where the end user or occupier is known, the Council agrees they should be included the process of developing an Employment and Skills plan for the development proposal. Para 19.10 has been amended accordingly.

### **Representation 200380 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 19.10 refers to having Skills and Employment Plans approved 3 months prior to the implementation/commencement of development. This is a very early trigger and if everything else was in place for development to begin (i.e. the discharge of relevant planning conditions/obligations), we see no reason why a development should be delayed by a further 3 months. This will harm the delivery of schemes. The trigger for approval should relate to the commencement of development or any other suitable trigger as agreed on a case by case basis through planning application discussions. The text should be amended to reflect this.

Within paragraph 19.16, the requirement for 1 apprenticeship per 1,000 sqm of employment space could be appropriate for a higher employment density uses such as office or retail, but is not likely to be achievable for lower density uses such as logistics, datacentres, manufacturing etc. A variation for lower density uses should be reflected in the text.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The intention would be that the three month implementation period could be concurrent with other processes, therefore it would not delay development. If there were site specific evidence that this would result in delay that could be addressed.

Para 19.16 relates to the size of the development and not the density of the end use. It concerns the number of construction apprenticeship per 1,000sqm of built floorspace which has no bearing on whether this is for an office, a logistics hub or datacentre.



### **Representation 200447 (Mills & Reeve LLP)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Regarding 19.13 A best endeavours obligation is highly onerous and normally commercially unacceptable. It would provide a significant disincentive to prospective developers, investors and commercial occupiers which could be obstructive to economic growth in the region and undermine the availability of skills, training and supply chain opportunities. A reasonable endeavours obligation would be sufficient and could result in greater availability of skills, training and supply chain opportunities.

Paragraph 19.14-In a similar vein to the comments on paragraph 19.13, these requirements are likely to be viewed as onerous by some commercial occupiers and flexibility is needed.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The endeavours relate to the developer meeting their employment and skills obligations on-site which is not considered onerous. Nevertheless, this has been amended from 'best' to 'reasonable'. Further, as set out in Chapter 2 of the SPD, development proposals will be assessed on their merits and obligations negotiated. If flexibility is required, this can be considered on a case-by-case basis based on the particulars of the development proposed.

### **Representation 200588 (Cambridgeshire County Council)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The penultimate bullet point could be strengthened with the mention of training and employment opportunities for green skills specifically, whilst retaining the good retrofitting example provided.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted.

## **Chapter 20: Planning Obligations to Support Affordable Workspace**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 7

### **Representation 200297 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

No comment in relation to Chapter 20 of the SPD.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted.

### **Representation 200303 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Whilst the principle of this approach may seem sensible care needs to be taken as to not dis-incentivise business from progressing beyond the affordable space that they occupy. Clear guidelines and thresholds would need to be established.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Paragraph 20.17 acknowledges lease arrangements and move on rates need to be considered.

### **Representation 200356 (Jaynic)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Jaynic appreciates that the new Local Plan provides an opportunity for a policy on affordable workspace to be inserted. However, at present there are no policies within the adopted Local Plan and with the emerging Local Plan only commencing works this Autumn/Winter 2025, we are of the opinion that this should be something that is examined through the Local Plan process with an appointed Inspector, as the threshold of affordable housing would be. Whilst Jaynic would not be averse to providing a certain amount of affordable workspace on commercial development in South Cambridgeshire, further clarity is required to understand how this will be practically carried out, for example through S106.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The SPD acknowledged that this is an emerging policy area, and not within the local plans. However, we consider there is value in including guidance on this matter whilst clearly acknowledging the policy status.

### **Representation 200381 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

We do not consider that affordable workspace requirements, which will have financial implications for schemes (in some cases significant), can be introduced through an SPD. This is introducing a new policy which SPDs cannot do as set out in National Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 61-008-20190315).

On a large scale employment development, 10% of space could equate to millions of pounds worth of opportunity cost, with significant impacts on development deliverability.

This section of the SPD should be removed and if an affordable workspace policy is pursued, it should be done so through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan where its impact on development viability can be evidenced.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. The SPD acknowledged that this is an emerging policy area, and not within the local plans. However, we consider there is value in including guidance on this matter whilst clearly acknowledging the policy status.

### **Representation 200408 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 20.11 states "the provision of an element of affordable employment space will be most suited to large commercial schemes, and as a minimum over 10,000m<sup>2</sup>,

in use classes E(g), B2 and B8. In London typical agreements have secured 10% of space within qualifying schemes.”

A comparison to London is provided but London is a different market place with different rent levels, supply and demand. There does not appear to be a local policy basis to ask for a contribution in relation to affordable workspace and therefore U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP question if the planning obligation meets the Regulation 122 tests.

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comments duly noted. The SPD acknowledged that this is an emerging policy area, and not with in the local plans. However, we consider there is value in including guidance on this matter whilst clearly acknowledging the policy status.

### **Representation 200454 (Urban & Civic)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The aspirations behind affordable workspace are laudable, and at Waterbeach Barracks we have been involved in activating meanwhile-community-uses in existing buildings at early stages of development to meet local demand. It should be recognised however that delivering this with ongoing subsidy within new built commercial spaces will be a challenging obligation for many developers, as well as creating onerous management approaches which may lead to additional costs for developers. These aspects will need to be considered as part of the viability process to ensure the obligation is proportionate and sustainable.

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. The SPD acknowledged that this is an emerging policy area, and not with in the local plans. However, we consider there is value in including guidance on this matter whilst clearly acknowledging the policy status.

### **Representation 200580 (Carter Jonas on behalf of various named clients)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Regarding Paragraph 20.11, It is not clear what is being asked for here. A comparison to London is provided but London is a different marketplace with different rent levels, supply and demand. There does not appear to be a local policy basis to ask for a contribution in relation to affordable workspace and therefore it is questioned whether the planning obligation meets the Regulation 122 tests.

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. The SPD acknowledged that this is an emerging policy area, and not with in the local plans. However, we consider there is value in including guidance on this matter whilst clearly acknowledging the policy status.

## **Chapter 21: Public Rights of Way**

Total representations for this Chapter: 4

### **Representation 200298 (Savills UK)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Further details are requested as to where development will be required to establish improved links to new and existing PRow and the wider PRow network and the cost associated with these requirements.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Planning obligations may be necessary to meet the requirements of the Local Plan policies referenced in the draft SPD. Making developments permeable and accessible may require investment in public rights of way. An amendment has been made to clarify the types of development that may trigger an obligation.

### **Representation 200325 (Homes Builder Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The SPD suggests that planning obligations may be sought from any development, and these may be sought on-site as part of the development works to secure new rights of way over the proposed development site or for the upgrade of existing routes. It also suggests that financial contributions may be appropriate where necessary to establish better links / connections between new and existing routes on site. The HBF is concerned about the lack of detail provided in relation to this requirement, it is not apparent under what circumstances developments may be required to establish better links to new and existing routes or to the wider network, or as to how long these new connections may expected to be and therefore what the costs may be.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Planning obligations may be necessary to meet the requirements of the Local Plan policies referenced in the draft SPD. Making developments permeable and accessible may require investment in public rights of way. An amendment has been made to clarify the types of development that may trigger an obligation.

### **Representation 200337 (Cambridge Group of Ramblers)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The planning guidance needs to address the opportunity for maintenance and creation of new footpaths in conjunction to these major pieces of transport infrastructure.

The strategy for Cambridge and South Cambs on PROWs should not only aim to maintain the current network of footpaths but enhance the connectivity between footpaths.

The Ramblers Association's campaign on 'Don't Lose Your Way' has identified potentially unrecorded paths and members are producing the evidence to try to save these lost paths. (Map in full response) of Cambridge and South Cambs and the number of potentially lost paths that developers should be asked to respect and add into their planning application proposals

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Planning obligations may be necessary to meet the requirements of the Local Plan policies referenced in the draft SPD. It is not the role

of this SPD to set a strategy regarding rights of way, but to assist in implementing the Local Plan.

### **Representation 200532 (British Horse Society)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Developments only 'may' create a need for publicly accessible routes on-site or to move in and out of the development and then only to link with existing pedestrian and cycle routes and the wider rights of way network! Equestrians cannot use pedestrian / cycle active travel routes therefore they are, once again excluded. This statement is highly discriminatory against those residents who want to use soft surface rights of way and not urban style sealed cycle and pedestrian paths. It fails to meet the requirements of the Cambridgeshire ROWIP and CPCA Transport Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The SPD uses the term 'may' as it will depend on the circumstances of the individual development proposal. It does not mean that where implementation of the local plan policy required PROW improvements or more specifically equestrian links, that this would not be sought if justified.

## **Chapter 22: Healthcare**

Total representations for this Chapter: 24

### **Representation 200216 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.1's recognition that "health provision is an integral component of sustainable development – access to essential healthcare services promotes good health outcomes and supports the overall social and economic wellbeing of an area" is welcomed, as is the Local planning Authority's commitment to "...work with the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Integrated Care System (ICS) to assess the need for additional health infrastructure and ensure that all residents have easy access to the care they need when they need it." The definition of healthcare infrastructure must be in its widest form (incorporating secondary, community and tertiary care) to support growth.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment noted and support is welcomed.

### **Representation 200217 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.3 – The commitment by the local planning authority to impose "...planning obligations ... to mitigate the impact of the development and secure the required additional health infrastructure provision" is welcomed. Again the definition of healthcare infrastructure must be in its widest form.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment noted and support is welcomed.

### **Representation 200218 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Following the wording proposed for primary healthcare contributions in Paragraph 22.23 the ICS partners will be commencing work to develop an evidence-based methodology for mitigating the impact of development on the wider healthcare system and would welcome the opportunity to further explore this with officers how this could be applied

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils will continue to work with stakeholders on infrastructure planning matters.

### **Representation 200221 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.9, line 5; replace the word "are" with the word "and".

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The grammatical error has been amended in Paragraph 22.9.

### **Representation 200222 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.10 – the bullet points are misleading. The following section should be moved to the end of the bullet point list to aid clarity:

- o "To note, there are two surgeries within the Greater Cambridgeshire boundary which do not fall within the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough ICS:
  - Bassingbourn Surgery – branch surgery of the Ashwell Surgery which falls under Hertfordshire and West Essex ICS
  - Gamlingay Surgery – branch surgery of Greensand Medical Practice which falls under Bedfordshire, Luton and Milton Keynes ICS".

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The suggested amendment to Paragraph 22.10 has been made

### **Representation 200223 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.10 – the bullet point referencing the hospitals within the ICS should be reworded to read "Three Hospitals (Addenbrooke's Hospital, Rosie Hospital and Royal Papworth Hospital)"

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The suggested amendment to Paragraph 22.10 has been made.

### **Representation 200224 (Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.36, bullet point 2 (New build health facilities), line one to read “this may be either on-site or off-site depending...”

**Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. The grammatical correction to Paragraph 22.36 has been made.

**Representation 200299 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)**

**Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.20 describes that engagement with the ICS is encouraged for all scales of developed that propose 200 or more residential units. As stated above this raises the question of what if the ICS do not engage effectively with the applicant. Guidance should be added on this to ensure the developer will not be hindered in the decision-making process if the ICS have failed to engage effectively or make changes to their preferred approach.

**Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. Planning (both plan making and decision taking) requires the positive engagement and input of many infrastructure providers. This issue is not limited to the ICS who the Councils have a constructive partnership working approach with.

**Representation 200304 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)**

**Main issues raised in representation**

Please consider two High Court decisions were The University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust, R (On the Application Of) v Harborough District Council [2023] EWHC 263 (Admin) (“the Leicester NHS Trust”) and Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust, R (On the Application Of) v Malvern Hills District Council & Ors [2023] EWHC 1995 (Admin) (“the Worcestershire NHS Trust”). These suggest that such contributions are now lawful.

**Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils are aware of these decisions where section 106 contributions were sought to compensate the Trust for the loss in funding, and that contributions were to be directed towards services rather than infrastructure. The decisions did not say that contributions towards health infrastructure were not lawful as a matter of principle. To comply with the CIL Regulations the Council will ensure that an infrastructure project exists in all cases where health contributions are requested.

**Representation 200305 (Dr Stephen Davies)**

**Main issues raised in representation**

The setting out of a well-worked up scheme for quantifying and securing developer contributions towards primary care facilities is a welcome step forward. This needs to be balanced with attention to how developer contributions can be secured for healthcare infrastructure in other sectors: hospitals, hospices, mental health, and community services. The statutory responsibilities of the Integrated Care Board, and the non-statutory nature of the Integrated Care System, should be further clarified.

**Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. The SPD acknowledges that, in addition to primary healthcare infrastructure, strategic scale proposals may require provision or contributions



towards wider health infrastructure including acute, mental health, and/or community health provision. Ultimately this will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Integrated care boards (ICBs) replaced clinical commissioning groups (CCGs) in the NHS in England from 1 July 2022. They are responsible for planning health services for their local population by managing the NHS budget and working with local providers of NHS services, such as hospitals and GP practices.

### **Representation 200308 (Ms Annabel Sykes)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The coverage of this chapter, in terms of health and social care infrastructure, is much too limited.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils working with health providers consider that the SPD provides a clear framework for seeking health related planning obligations, but acknowledge that further issues may need to be addressed on a site by site basis depending on the nature of the development proposal and its impacts reflecting regulations around planning obligations.

### **Representation 200326 (Home Builders Federation)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The HBF is concerned with the overly simplified assumption within this section of the SPD that new housing developments increase the total number of patients that need primary care in a localised area. This may not always be the case, this very much depends on where people are moving to and from and potentially the reason for the move. It may be that only a small number of households are actually moving from outside of the area, and therefore a simple calculation of the total population of the newly built homes may significantly overestimate the health requirements. The HBF is also concerned by the assumption in paragraph 22.28 which states that if the baseline position is that the existing primary care infrastructure does have capacity to accommodate the additional population growth caused by the development a contribution will be required. The HBF hopes this is a typographical error and it should be if the primary care infrastructure does not have capacity, otherwise the HBF considers this requirement highly inappropriate. As with other requirements the HBF remains concerned about the resources required to undertake this planning obligation, the resources required to identify the appropriate evidence, to undertake the calculation and to actually provide the provision.

#### **Councils' assessment**

The Councils are content that new housing development increases the overall population of the area and that the increased population will place increased demands for healthcare, including new healthcare services and facilities to meet this need.

Paragraph 22.28 should refer to circumstances where existing primary care infrastructure does not have spare capacity to meet the demands of new development. An amendment has therefore been made.

### **Representation 200334 (NHS Property Service Ltd)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Health provision is an integral component of sustainable development – access to essential healthcare services promotes good health outcomes and supports the overall social and economic wellbeing of an area.

We support the approach of the draft Planning Obligations SPD (Chapter 22) but consider the suggested amendments to draft paragraphs 22.23-22.25 will contribute to ensuring the SPD reflects adopted health commissioning standards.

Suggested wording amendments (addition of this paragraph) “22.24 Expenditure of planning obligations related to primary care facilities will normally be area-based on facility within the local PCN(s) serving the development. In limited circumstances expenditure may be directed at a wider scale where this is deemed necessary to support service delivery objectives. 22.24 22.25 For smaller schemes, to enable the required additional capacity to be in place...”

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils have made suggested amendments to paragraphs 22.24 and 22.25.

### **Representation 200364 (Turley on behalf of Vistry Strategic Land)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Section 22 of the SPD sets out the requirements for Healthcare obligations and contributions. The main cost identified is primary care infrastructure. While detailed costs are provided within the SPD, we highlight that these costs have the potential to be significant for larger developments and need to be viability tested.

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. The extant policy requirements within both Local Plans, including the primary and secondary healthcare services and facility needs, were included in the respective IDPs for the Local Plans and were the subject of viability assessment. There is no evidence to suggest that the conclusions reached in the original viability assessments needs revisiting. Rather, more recent viability benchmarking ([see paper](#)), undertaken in support of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals, continues to clearly demonstrate that development across Greater Cambridge remains viable even with the higher and additional policy requirements being proposed through the emerging Local Plan.

As set out at Paragraph 2.49, if an applicant considers the financial ask of all obligations required of a specific development proposal will place the development at risk of being unviable, if supported by evidence and agreed by the LPA, a tailored approach will be considered to ensure this risk is appropriately managed.

### **Representation 200382 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Important for the SPD to recognise that new development cannot be required to make good existing deficits in provision. Paragraph 22.15 states that there are issues related to the general background population growth, the ageing population and an estate that is no longer fit for purpose. While these pressures are all valid,

resolving them is not the responsibility of land owners or developers.

Paragraph 22.19 states that strategic-scale proposals may be required to contribute to acute, mental health or community health provision. These are strategic level services, funded at a National Level by the NHS. They do not meet the Regulation 122 tests of necessity and there is caselaw which supports this position. Reference to these services should therefore be removed.

The typical approach to calculation of GP need is with respect to number of GPs rather than sqm. We acknowledge that the changes in service delivery methods may mean that sqm is a more useful metric in some cases. If demand is to be based on sqm, then the Integrated Care System should publish up to date data on the size of the existing estate so that the developer is able to undertake this assessment and so the overall approach is evidenced and transparent.

Average household size of 2.4 people set out in paragraph 22.29 is a useful starting point, there should be flexibility in the formula to consider population calculations for specialist housing or different housing typologies.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The Councils agree that planning obligations should not be used solely to resolve existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision or to secure contributions to the achievement of wider planning objectives that are not necessary to allow consent to be given for a particular development. Contributions will only be sought to meet the needs arising from the development.

The SPD calculates the floor area requirement based on the GP need (para 2.28 explains that 1 GP is needed per every 1,750 patients and that 120sqm is needed for every GP). Where section 106 contributions are sought the ICB will evidence in their consultation the capacity (or lack thereof) in the local surgeries and contributions will only be secured where there is an identified deficiency in capacity.

Development will specialist housing or different housing typologies will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

### **Representation 200415 (University of Cambridge)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.37 requires flexibility with respect to the potential mitigation strategy. We accept that some degree of flexibility is required but an obligation that does not have any restriction on where and how funds will be spent to ensure that they are directly related to the development does not meet the Regulation 122 tests.

Paragraph 22.40 confirms that the suggested sqm benchmark includes the full capital cost of construction. It should however also state whether this includes site levelling and servicing, which is often done by the developer ahead of land transfer and should be discounted from any further capital contribution.

Paragraph 22.43 states that the service needs to be viable, and this could affect lease terms. If a building is to be let to the NHS, then this space should pay a rent in accordance with the district valuation. This should be made clear in the paragraph.

**Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The proposed wording for any planning obligation is set out at para 22.23 which establishes a cascade for the use of the contribution if the preferred investment option is later identified as no longer being possible. This is consistent with national guidance.

Where a health facility is to be provided onsite the section 106 requirements will be set out on a case-by-case basis.

**Representation 200420 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)****Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.1's recognition that "health provision is an integral component of sustainable development – access to essential healthcare services promotes good health outcomes and supports the overall social and economic wellbeing of an area" is welcomed, as is the Local planning Authority's commitment to "...work with the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Integrated Care System (ICS) to assess the need for additional health infrastructure and ensure that all residents have easy access to the care they need when they need it." The definition of healthcare infrastructure must be in its widest form (incorporating secondary, community and tertiary care) to support growth.

**Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted.

**Representation 200421 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)****Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.3 – The commitment by the local planning authority to impose "...planning obligations ... to mitigate the impact of the development and secure the required additional health infrastructure provision" is welcomed. Again the definition of healthcare infrastructure must be in its widest form.

**Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted.

**Representation 200422 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)****Main issues raised in representation**

Following the wording proposed for primary healthcare contributions in Paragraph 22.23 the ICS partners will be commencing work to develop an evidence-based methodology for mitigating the impact of development on the wider healthcare system and would welcome the opportunity to further explore this with officers how this could be applied.

**Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Additional acknowledgment of further work being done by health bodies may be required.

**Representation 200425 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)****Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.9, line 5; replace the word "are" with the word "and"

**Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Grammatical amendment to Paragraph 22.9 has been made.

### **Representation 200426 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.10 – the bullet points are misleading. The following section should be moved to the end of the bullet point list to aid clarity:

- “To note, there are two surgeries within the Greater Cambridgeshire boundary which do not fall within the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough ICS:
- Bassingbourn Surgery – branch surgery of the Ashwell Surgery which falls under Hertfordshire and West Essex ICS
- Gamlingay Surgery – branch surgery of Greensand Medical Practice which falls under Bedfordshire, Luton and Milton Keynes ICS”

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. Amendment to Paragraph 22.10 has been made to improve clarity.

### **Representation 200427 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.10 – the bullet point referencing the hospitals within the ICS should be reworded to read “Three Hospitals (Addenbrooke’s Hospital, Rosie Hospital and Royal Papworth Hospital)”

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. Amendment to Paragraph 22.10 has been made.

### **Representation 200428 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

Paragraph 22.36, bullet point 2 (New build health facilities), line one to read “this may be either on-site or off-site depending.

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly noted. The grammatical correction to Paragraph 22.36 has been made.

### **Representation 200464 (Tor & Co on behalf of Hill Residential Ltd (Hill))**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

It is noted in paragraph 22.29 that in estimating the impact of a development on the registered patient population, an average household size of 2.4 people is identified. It is unclear why this value has been specified given the more detailed population by dwelling size (as set out in Appendix A) used in other chapters of the SPD. This should be reviewed and clarified.

#### **Councils’ assessment**

Comment duly Noted. The approach to planning obligation regarding health in this chapter is guided by the policy of the ICS.

## Chapter 23: Other Potential Development Specific Requirements

Total representation received for this Chapter: 5

### Representation 200300 (Savills on behalf of Pigeon)

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The section of the SPD indicates that the previous sections may not encompass all potential planning obligations that could apply to any given development. It lists additional possible obligations. Savills would like to express concern about the possibility of further planning obligations that not specified in this SPD. This uncertainty complicates the development industry's ability to account for these costs in their land purchases

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The chapter reflects that it is not possible to identify all material considerations or matters that may require mitigation to make a development acceptable for every potential development scenario. As set out in the SPD, the pre-application process would be an appropriate mechanism to explore these issues.

### Representation 200327 (Home Builders Federation)

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The HBF is concerned that there are further potential planning obligations that may be required from development, that are not detailed in this policy or the Plan. This does not make it straightforward for the development industry to factor these costs into their land purchases or their consideration of the costs of development. This lack of certainty can be a real issue for developers, and may lead to delays in development coming forward.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. For clarity, the SPD is guidance and not planning policy. The chapter reflects the fact that it is not possible to identify all material considerations or matters that may require mitigation to make a development acceptable for every potential development scenario. It is considered important that the planning obligations SPD highlights this. As set out in the SPD, the pre-application process would be an appropriate mechanism to explore these issues.

### Representation 200365 (Turley on behalf of Vistry Strategic Land)

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

It is clear that the Council have not tested the viability implications of the additional requirements the SPD seeks to introduce and we are concerned about the impact that the SPD will have for existing planned for development. There are also several proposed obligations / contributions where it is not clear if the Councils have tested whether there are differences between the two authority areas. Overall, we are concerned that the document is lacking in detail and failing to provide detailed information around costings as highlighted.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. For clarity, the SPD does not 'seek to introduce additional requirements' on development. Rather, the SPD seeks to give effect to extant Local Plan policies. However, the types of planning obligations that may be sought will



depend on the nature and scale of the development proposal and site circumstances. Not all obligations set out in the SPD will be applicable to every development and, for some developments, obligations will be necessary that are not included within the SPD. The fact is that it is not possible to identify all material considerations or matters that may require mitigation to make a development acceptable for every potential development scenario.

In preparing the SPD, the Councils have taken careful consideration of any differences in policy requirements between the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and the City Local Plan. Where there are differences, the Councils considers the SPD clearly articulates these.

The Councils have updated the SPD to ensure that, where costs are set out, the source has been provided. The review undertaken of specific infrastructure costs will be published for consultation alongside re-consultation on the updated draft of the SPD in Summer 2025.

#### **Representation 200409 (Carter Jonas on behalf of U+I (Cambridge) Limited and Cambridge 4 LLP) and Representation 200581 (Carter Jonas on behalf of various named clients)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

The list included in the second paragraph appears to contain a broad list of requirements as a "catch-all" at the end of the document. Although policy references are listed alongside the potential obligations, the policy wording is also vague. Planning obligations should fall within Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) and should be specific requiring the land to be used in a specific way or restricting the development or use of the land in a specific way. The inclusion of general obligations in this chapter should be reviewed.

##### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The chapter reflects that it is not possible to identify all material considerations or matters that may require mitigation to make a development acceptable for every potential development scenario. Where circumstances mean an obligation is required this can be made specific to the development based on the circumstances of the development, meeting the requirements of regulations.

## **Appendix A: Children and Occupancy Yield**

Total representations for this Chapter: 2

#### **Representation 200387 (University of Cambridge)**

##### **Main issues raised in representation**

The average household size, and in particular the number of children per household, tends to differ significantly between houses and flats. There are situations where good design and setting can make flats relatively more attractive to families with children but on average the trend applies across the UK. As such a distinction should be made between houses and flats and this should be incorporated into the Appendix.



### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Chapter 11 of the draft SPD advises that, "the County Council will use its locally derived child yield multipliers to estimate child yield. These are adopted by the County Council Children's Services Committee Children and Young Peoples Committee and reviewed periodically to ensure they remain up to date and reflective of demographic and development trends. Whilst national data (adjusted) is available, this is considered less specific and does not take precedent." The figures in the draft SPD represent their latest position.

### **Representation 200453 (Urban & Civic)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

We note that the proposed Child Yield Multipliers are in excess of those adopted by CCC within its Planning Obligations Strategy (March 2016) across several age categories and dwelling sizes. It should be noted that the Education Evidence Review mechanism within the Waterbeach S106 agreement is underpinned by CCC's detailed multiplier.

It is unclear how the multipliers set out within the SPD have been calculated and their applicability in the context of CCC's role as the Education Authority.

In paragraph 11.9, there is ambiguity in the wording which states "(not school rolls)", which needs to be clarified.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comments duly noted. Chapter 11 of the draft SPD advises that, "the County Council will use its locally derived child yield multipliers to estimate child yield. These are adopted by the County Council Children's Services Committee Children and Young Peoples Committee and reviewed periodically to ensure they remain up to date and reflective of demographic and development trends. Whilst national data (adjusted) is available, this is considered less specific and does not take precedent." The figures in the draft SPD represent their latest position.

## **Appendix B: Schedule of Inputs Required for Viability Appraisal**

Total representations for this Chapter: 0

### **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA): Draft Planning Obligations SPD**

Total representations for this Chapter: 0

### **Sustainability Appraisal Screening Report: Draft Planning Obligations SPD**

Total representation received for this Chapter: 1

### **Representation 200430 (Natural England)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

We have reviewed the SA/SEA Screening Report provided. Natural England agree with the conclusions and that further assessment stages should not be required.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted.

## **Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report: Draft Planning Obligations SPD**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 1

### **Representation 200431 (Natural England)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

We have reviewed the HRA Report provided. Natural England agree with the conclusions and that further assessment stages should not be required.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted.

## **Consultation Statement: Draft Planning Obligations SPD**

Total representations received for this Chapter: 2

### **Representation 200339 (Linton Parish Council)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

The consultation was poorly timed, as it was at the end of the year. It was not possible for the Councillors to read all three documents in the limited period and present considered comments.

LPC propose that there should be individual consultations for each supplementary planning document, to enable sufficient time to review the information and submit comments.

#### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. The consultation period was extended noting the time of year. There can be benefits in consulting on a number of documents at the same time, as it enables the Councils to focus their resources on consultation events and publicity. We appreciate it can be challenging for voluntary bodies to respond to the volume of content. On these particular issues though and for this purpose this level of content is necessary. However, we will aim to take on board suggestions, including how we can make our content more accessible.

### **Representation 200589 (Bassingbourn-cum Kneesworth Parish Council)**

#### **Main issues raised in representation**

As the documents totalled several hundred pages, councillors are unable to read all the documents and therefore the Parish Council are unable to comment on the

consultation. They are concerned that silence is taken for support, they cannot say whether they support it or not. It may have helped if the information was more specific to their area. The Parish Council intend to object to future consultations if they do not come in a format that is easily to digest and understand.

### **Councils' assessment**

Comment duly noted. Officers are currently considering the representation and will look at opportunities to simplify the SPD, such as including an executive summary, prior to re-consulting on the draft SPD in Summer 2025. However, planning obligations are a particularly technical and content heavy area of planning guidance and may therefore not be easily simplified.

## **Appendix A: List of organisations consulted**

The following organisations were directly notified of the draft Planning Obligations SPD via email, or by post where no email address was available. Individuals are not listed. It should be noted that other individuals and organisations were also contacted that do not appear on this list.

All Parish Councils and Residents Associations  
Adjacent Local Authorities

Abellio Greater Anglia  
Accent Nene Housing Society Limited  
Addenbrooke's Equalities Officer  
Advisory Council for the Education of Romany and other Travellers (ACERT)  
Age UK Cambridgeshire & Peterborough  
Airport Operators Association  
Amusement Catering Equipment Society (ACES)  
Anglia Ruskin University  
Anglian Water  
Bedfordshire and River Ivel Internal Drainage Board  
Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association  
British Gas  
British Horse Society  
BT Group Plc  
Building Research Establishment  
Cam Health  
Cambridge and County Developments (formerly Cambridge Housing Society)  
Cambridge Area Bus Users  
Cambridge Campaign for Better Transport  
Cambridge and District Citizens Advice Bureau  
Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service  
Cambridge Crown Court  
Cambridge Cycling Campaign (CamCycle)  
Cambridge Dial a Ride  
Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum  
Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service  
Cambridge Friends of the Earth  
Cambridge Online  
Cambridge Group of the Ramblers  
Cambridge Inter-Faith Group  
Cambridge Past, Present & Future  
Cambridge Peterborough & South Lincolnshire (CPSL) Mind  
Cambridge Rape Crisis Centre  
Cambridge Regional College  
Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust  
Cambridge Water  
Cambridge Women's Aid  
Cambridge Women's Resource Centre  
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust  
Cambridgeshire ACRE  
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Association of Local Councils  
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Campaign to Protect Rural England  
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group  
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority  
Cambridgeshire Chamber of Commerce  
Cambridgeshire Community Foundation  
Cambridgeshire Constabulary  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council  
Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service

Cambridgeshire Football Association  
Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board  
Care Network Cambridgeshire  
Centre 33  
Church Commissioners for England  
Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)  
Confederation of British Industry -East of England  
Conservators of the River Cam  
Country Land & Business Association  
CPSL Mind  
Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure LTD (CTIL)  
Defence Infrastructure Organisation  
Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs  
Disability Cambridgeshire  
East West Rail  
Eastern Region Rowing Council  
Ely Diocesan Board  
Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards  
Encompass Network  
Environment Agency  
Equality and Human Rights Commission  
ESP Utilities Group  
Fields in Trust  
Flagship Homes  
Forestry Commission  
Friends, Families and Travellers Community Base  
Friends of the Cam  
Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook  
Friends of Stourbridge Common  
Greater Cambridge Partnership  
Harlaxton Energy Networks Ltd.  
Hastoe Housing Association Ltd.  
Hazardous Installations Inspectorate  
Healthwatch Cambridgeshire  
Highways England  
Historic England  
Home Builders Federation (HBF)  
Homes England  
Hundred Houses Society Limited  
Huntingdonshire Association for Community Transport (HACT)  
Iceni Projects  
Indigo Networks  
Institute of Directors -Eastern Branch  
Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)  
Logistics UK (formerly Freight Transport Association)  
Marine Management Organisation  
MBNL (EE & Three)  
Mobile Operators Association  
National Grid Plc  
National House Building Council

National Housing Federation  
National Travellers Action Group  
Natural Cambridgeshire  
Natural England  
Network Rail  
NHS England  
Openreach  
Ormiston Children's and Family Trust  
Over and Willingham Internal Drainage Board  
Planning Inspectorate  
Road Haulage Association  
Royal Mail  
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)  
Sanctuary Housing Association  
Shelter  
South Cambridgeshire Youth Council  
Sport England  
SSE  
Stagecoach East  
Sustrans (East of England)  
Swavesey Internal Drainage Board  
The Association of Circus Proprietors  
The Coal Authority  
The Crown Estate  
The Kite Trust  
The Lawn Tennis Association  
The Magog Trust  
The National Trust  
The Papworth Trust  
The Showman's Guild of Great Britain  
The Theatres Trust  
The Traveller Movement  
The Wildlife Trust  
Transport for London  
Travel for Work Partnership  
The Traveller Movement  
UK Power Networks  
University of Cambridge  
Utility Assets  
Virgin Media  
Woodland Trust