# Greater Cambridge Local Plan – The First Proposals

# Form to assist in drafting responses to the consultation

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

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

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

### What to comment on:

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

## Vision and development strategy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section / Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Vision and aims | The Vision and aims of the plan are heavily reliant on the existing site allocations within the plan area. There is an emphasis on large strategic sites. We support the roles of these site, which can deliver infrastructure to serve the wider area, however we believe that this approach should be balanced with the allocation of a range of smaller scale sites. A range of sites would better aid the delivery of housing within the plan area during the entire plan period. Large sites can often take several years before they begin to deliver housing at a steady rate, smaller sites of less than 200 homes should be introduced to allow for housing delivery early within the plan period. |
| How much development, and where – general comments |  |
| S/JH: New jobs and homes | N/A |
| S/DS: Development strategy | The reliance on existing, large site allocations should be balanced with smaller sites within existing sustainable settlements, such as the land west of Station Road, Fulbourn, to maintain the smooth delivery of housing throughout the plan period.  The above issue has been made clear in the Letwin Review, which focused on the delivery of large housing sites, and recent Local Plan examinations, such as Uttlesford and St Albans, where the focus of the plans only on large sites for delivery has been heavily criticised.  In addition the Cambridge & Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER), which was published in September 2018, concluded that 'Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is an area which already makes a huge contribution to the UK, and which holds great promise for the future. It also faces risks, which could bring the success to an end, and challenges relating to creating an inclusive society where economic growth works for everyone'.  The CPIER report, advocates a 'blended spatial strategy' of four possible scenarios:  - densification  - dispersal  - fringe growth  - transport corridors  It concluded that *'some densification, particularly in Cambridge, is needed, though this should happen away from the historic centre, and more on the edges, as and where new development sites come forward. There should be some scope for expanding development around the city boundary, but intelligently planned transport links will be needed to avoid worsening of congestion. In Cambridge specifically though there are limits to the growth of the city in other directions, the east side of the city (of which Fulbourn is on) offers significant scope for housing and commercial development. Such development would have the advantage of being close to the principal centres of employment and the existing rail infrastructure whilst also opening up opportunities for new transport links to connect the main centres of employment more effectively'*.  The land west of Station Road, Fulbourn is a very sustainable location, which is consistent with the conclusion of the CPIER report. The site is well-related to the centre of Fulbourn, which benefits from a high quality bus service and the site is also adjacent to the Cambridge to Newmarket railway line, where land has been safeguarded to provide for a new railway station should it be required in the future. Therefore the site should be included as an allocation within this local plan to support the sustainable delivery of housing. |
| S/SH: Settlement hierarchy | We disagree with the proposed settlement hierarchy, in particular in relation to Fulbourn.  Fulbourn is classed as a minor rural centre. This would limit any development proposals within the village to 30 homes or less. The land west of Station Road is centrally located and has potential to deliver up to 150 homes within Fulbourn. The site has excellent links to the sustainable transport network via the Fulbourn Greenway.  We consider Fulbourn’s designation as a minor rural centre is contradictory to the allocation proposed at Fulbourn and Ida Darwin hospitals for some 275 homes. This demonstrates that Fulbourn has capacity for sustainable development of new homes and infrastructure. Therefore, we propose that the limit on size of proposals within minor rural centres should be removed.  We consider that villages can play a significant contribution to the overall mix of development within Greater Cambridge. This limit on development proposals within rural centres will inhibit this.  Growth in villages is essential to enable them to grow, to support existing services and infrastructure such as existing public transport, schools, and shops. Carefully planned development can help support the future of villages such as Fulbourn.  The land west of Station Road is located within close proximity to shops, services, and facilities including a primary school, together with regular bus services to major employment locations such as Capital Park, Tesco, Biomedical Campus/Addenbrookes Hospital, the railway station area, and the historic city centre and should not be discounted for development. |
| S/SB: Settlement boundaries | N/A |

## Cambridge urban area

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

## Edge of Cambridge

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

## New settlements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| New settlements - general comments | N/A |
| S/CB: Cambourne | N/A |
| S/NS: Existing new settlements | N/A |

## Rural southern cluster

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

## Rest of the rural area

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Rest of the rural area - general comments | We believe that Fulbourn is an excellent location for sustainable development.  The land west of Station Road is centrally located and has potential to deliver up to 150 homes within Fulbourn, with excellent links to the sustainable transport network via the Fulbourn Greenway.  Evidence from the CPIER (2018) report identified the east side of the city (of which Fulbourn is on) as offering significant scope for housing and commercial development. Such development would have the advantage of being close to the principal centres of employment and the existing rail infrastructure whilst also opening up opportunities for new transport links to connect the main centres of employment more effectively'.  The land west of Station Road is located within close proximity to shops, services, and facilities including a primary school, together with regular bus services to major employment locations such as Capital Park, Tesco, Biomedical Campus/Addenbrookes Hospital, the railway station area, and the historic city centre and should not be discounted for development. Development of the land west of Station Road would allow for the sustainable growth of Fulbourn as a rural centre and should be included within the plan. |
| S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area | It is clear that policy S/RRA/H/3 (Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals) are an excellent location for development. Therefore, it seems illogical that available land, so close to this location, such as the land west of Station Road, should be overlooked by this plan. The land west of Station Road has enviable links to the proposed Fulbourn Greenway and would provide an excellent expansion site within the centre of the village. We suggest that the land west of Station Road should be included as an additional allocation within the rural area. |
| S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area | N/A |

## Climate change

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

## Biodiversity and green spaces

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

## Wellbeing and inclusion

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

## Great places policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy** | **Your comments** |
| Great places – general comments | Whilst we largely agree with the Greater Places policies, we believe a more extensive review of the Green Belt should be carried out to include sites such as the land west of Station Road, Fulbourn, which represents an excellent location for sustainable development. |
| GP/PP: People and place responsive design | N/A |
| GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character | N/A |
| GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt | The Green Belt provides an important role in preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and serving the five purposes set out in paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework namely:  a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;  b) to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;  c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;  d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and  e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.  A comprehensive review of the original 2012 Green Belt Review should be undertaken as part of the evidence base underpinning the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan. In many instances there may be opportunities to release land currently within the Green Belt, which plays a limited role in serving the five purposes set out in the NPPF, such as the land west of Station Road, Fulbourn.  Given the geography of Greater Cambridge, in which many of the most sustainable parts of the spatial planning area are located within the Green Belt, it is considered that some Green Belt release should form part of the overall spatial strategy.  In this way, the area can help to reduce travel distances and help facilitate sustainability through the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure.  The important role that the Green Belt plays is acknowledged, however a flexible approach needs to be taken where sites such as land west of Station Road, Fulbourn benefit from their proximity to existing frequent public transport (with a bus stop just 100 metres south of the site). The proposed Fulbourn Greenway being bought forward by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) would also to provide high quality sustainable transport infrastructure to further improve connectivity.  In addition, the land west of Station Road, Fulbourn presents opportunities for Green Belt release that would help to enable a sustainable large village such as Fulbourn to grow in a sustainable manner.  The site itself is very well-contained and provides a very limited contribution to the Green Belt purposes.  The site is surround on 3 sides by housing development, and the railway and industrial area to its northern edge.  Its release would play no role in facilitating unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and would not result in towns merging into one another.  While it would play a limited role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, it is an exceptionally well-contained site with residential development on its western, southern, and eastern boundaries, and the Cambridge to Newmarket railway line providing a clear defensible boundary along its northern side.  The land west of Station Road, Fulbourn should be released from the Green Belt. |
| GP/QD: Achieving high quality development | N/A |
| GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm | N/A |
| GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets | N/A |
| GP/CC: Adapting heritage assets to climate change | N/A |
| GP/PH8: Protection of Public Houses | N/A |

## Jobs policies

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

## Homes policies

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

## Infrastructure policies

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

## Supporting documents on which we are consulting

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

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