



## GREATER CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN - THE FIRST PROPOSALS

Land North of Pampisford Road, Great Abington, CB21 6BD  
(HELAA Site Reference: 40539)

- Representation on behalf of landowners

---

**Client:**

Ms C. Sawyer Nutt

**Landowner:**

Ms C. Sawyer Nutt

**Our Reference:**

019-09

**Date:**

December 2021

**Prepared by:**

Vaughan Bryan BA (Hons), MPhil (Cantab)

**Checked by:**

Adam Tuck BSc (Hons), MRICS

## 1. Representations on Land North of Pampisford Road, Great Abington

- 1.1 Cheffins has been instructed by Ms C. Sawyer Nutt to promote their interests in 'Land North of Pampisford Road, Great Abington' (HELAA site reference: 40539). We propose a phased development that will deliver approximately 135 dwellings of mixed type and tenure in a sustainable location proximal to major employment centres and create attractive open spaces for the village.
- 1.2 Accompanying these representations is a concept masterplan (see **Appendix 1**) and a site analysis of the development strategy (see **Appendix 2**), both of which have been produced by Chaplin Farrant. These documents include several illustrations in support of the proposal.

### Site Location and Context

- 1.3 Land North of Pampisford Road, Great Abington (HELAA site ref: 40539) comprises an agricultural field located to the north of Pampisford Road, Great Abington (currently classified as a Group Village). The site adjoins the existing settlement envelope of Great Abington to the west and is bound to the north by the Hill Group's residential development – known as 'The Orchards' – and existing village allotments.
- 1.4 The Orchards was designed with the potential for development of site 40539 and includes an access road and associated services which have been designed so as to cater for prospective development. The land represents a logical extension to the village, being located adjacent to (and planned to connect with) The Orchards residential development.
- 1.5 The site is well located in relation to the key services and facilities of Great Abington, being only 500m from the village shop, post office, pub, hall, playing fields, primary school and preschool – a distance that is easily walkable.
- 1.6 The site is located wholly in Flood Zone 1 and there are no physical constraints that would prevent residential development coming forward on this site.

### Masterplanning Approach

- 1.7 Included in Appendix 1 is an extract from the Concept Masterplan for the site by Chaplin Farrant. As illustrated, the site can deliver approximately 135 dwellings on the edge of a highly sustainable location.
- 1.8 The site will include policy compliant levels of affordable housing and self-build plots. This use would include land for access/roads, landscaping, and public open space.
- 1.9 The benefits of the proposed development are wide-ranging and will promote the social, economic, and environmental objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. The site is located in a highly sustainable location, adjacent to existing services and facilities and will seek to promote the delivery of housing and continued economic growth in the region.
- 1.10 In particular, development of the site will provide:
  - Further family housing;
  - Mixed house-types;
  - Affordable homes;

- Opportunity for sheltered housing and self-build plots;
  - Housing close to local employment, transport routes and planned sustainable transport corridors; and
  - Potential for significant public open space, possibly as a chalk grassland.
- 1.11 Approximately 54% of the site area is proposed as public open space, which is designed to maintain existing ecological features on site (e.g. trees and hedges on the field boundary). The development will provide an improved, elevated green edge to the village, as well as significant recreational and biodiversity benefits for local residents.
- 1.12 Forthcoming improvements to active transport corridors along Great Abington will encourage sustainable modes of travel to existing local services and facilities.

### Technical Assessment

- 1.13 Some initial site and contextual assessments have been carried out in relation to masterplanning, landscaping and access. This work indicates that some of the scoring in the HELAA needs to be updated, and the site should be reconsidered for development as part of the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP). The following section provides commentary on the HELAA, including the assessment methodology and the individual scores given for site 40539.

### Comments on the Scoring Methodology and System

- 1.14 The performance of sites proposed for the GCLP has been coded using a traffic light system (red/amber/green). Although traffic light scoring systems are commonly used in this context, the performance criteria applied by the Greater Cambridge authorities appears overly stringent and inconsistent.
- 1.15 According to the published assessment criteria and supporting text within the HELAA, a site will generally be scored as amber where there is a detrimental impact which could be satisfactorily mitigated. This is an unusually strict approach which results in sites seeming to score more poorly than they should. It is more common for such assessments to apply an amber score to indicate that there is a potential issue that would need to be addressed through further detailed technical work or masterplanning. The current scoring matrix indicates deliverability issues where there are none. Where there are clear opportunities for effective mitigation of an impact or evidence to suggest that the matter is unlikely to constrain development, then a green rating would be more appropriate.
- 1.16 Ultimately, the key question that needs to be answered by a site assessment would be, "is development of this site acceptable in planning terms?" A revised scoring system based on the following key principles would be easier for stakeholders to understand a site's suitability for development:
- **Red:** NO. This is a major concern which would likely result in planning permission being refused.
  - **Amber:** POSSIBLY. This is a potential concern for which there may be a design solution (i.e. further site-specific work is needed).
  - **Green:** YES. This is unlikely to be a significant concern or constraint on development.

## Suitability for Development

- 1.17 Being outside the current settlement boundary for Great Abington (as defined in the South Cambridgeshire Adopted Policies Map), the site is assessed as being amber. However, the boundaries are due to be reviewed as part of the plan-making process for the GCLP, "with boundaries defined to take into account the present extent of the built-up area as well as planned new development" under proposed policy *S/SB Settlement Boundaries*. It is unclear if these planned boundary changes have been considered in the HELAA assessment. With recent development having been permitted outside the settlement boundary on the north-eastern edge of Great Abington – directly to the north of site 40539 (The Orchards development) – and the southern edge of the village (ref: S/1433/16/OL), it is anticipated that the site will be sustainably located directly adjacent to the revised boundary.

## Accessibility to Services and Facilities

- 1.18 *The Settlement Hierarchy Study* (Appendix 1H of the Development Strategy Topic Paper) notes that Great Abington is served by "good sustainable transport links" and, thus, "performed well using the sustainability scoring system". Great Abington is host to ample key services, including local shops, a post office, the Three Tuns pub, a village hall, playing fields, Great Abington Primary School, and Great Abington pre-school.
- 1.19 Site 40539 would benefit from the existing 13/13A bus services to Cambridge and Haverhill every 30 minutes, with the nearest existing stops being roughly 0.1 miles from the proposed southern access. The site's connectivity will also benefit from a new travel hub near the A11/A1307/A505, which will connect Great Abington to multiple areas with key amenities and employment opportunities, including the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, the Babraham Research Campus, and Granta Park. Meanwhile, the site's active transport connectivity will benefit from the forthcoming Linton Greenway (as envisioned under the South East Cambridge Transport scheme), granting residents safe access to services and facilities in Linton by foot or bicycle, in addition to the local amenities presently available in both Great and Little Abington.
- 1.20 In terms of major employment centres, Granta Park – a major business park that currently comprises 30 companies employing approximately 3,700 people – can be reached after an 8-minute cycle, a 30-minute walk, or a 5-minute drive from the centre of site 40539. Permission has been granted for a 34,220m<sup>2</sup> expansion to Granta Park (ref: S/1110/15/OL), which will provide additional sites for research and development (R&D) and, subsequently, further employment opportunities to surrounding conurbations (e.g. Great Abington). It is worth noting that when submitting this site as part of the Issues and Options Stage of the Local Plan, the employment figures of Granta Park was noted as circa 2,000. Therefore, there has been an increase of 85% in Granta Park's employment figures since February 2020 – major employment growth of which development of site 40539 would help to ensure is sustainable for the local area.
- 1.21 In addition, the Babraham Research Campus, which is scheduled for expansion under the GCLP, is only a 15-minute cycle or an 8-minute drive away from the centre of the proposed site; active transport connectivity between the Babraham Research Campus and site 40539 will be advanced further by the completion of the Linton Greenway. As such, given the site's proximity to these expanding key employment hubs, the residential capacity provided by the site would provide a sustainable way to utilise the already "high job to population ratio" of Great Abington identified by *The Settlement Hierarchy Study*.
- 1.22 Overall, site 40539 has excellent accessibility to key local services, transport, and employment opportunities by a range of modes of transport. Development of site 40539 would also provide a significant number of dwellings, including affordable and starter

homes, proximal to rapidly expanding employment hubs south of Cambridge, making commuting via active travel a more viable option for incoming employees that move to the local area – an outcome sought after by proposed policy *I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity*.

- 1.23 However, notwithstanding this assessment, it is clear that the current scoring system is in need of updating. The scoring system also needs to reflect changes in modern living and technological advancements, including increased homeworking, more widespread use of remote services (e.g. GP and pharmacies), increased online shopping (including groceries), and the growth in micro-mobility (e.g. e-bikes and electric scooters).

#### *Landscape and Townscape*

- 1.24 The HELAA states that the site is within National Character Area 88 – Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands. However, as **Appendix 3** illustrates, the proposed site in Great Abington is within NCA 87 – East Anglian Chalk. At a local level, the site is considered to fall within the 8A Pampisford Lowland Chalklands Landscape Character Area. Therefore, contrary to statements made within the HELAA, the landscape characteristics of the site are not atypical of the surrounding area.
- 1.25 Trees protected by a TPO on the north-western and western boundaries of the site are situated outside of proposed development areas and, where appropriate, have been integrated into proposed public open spaces within the site. There will therefore be no impact on the TPO trees as part of the development and this can be dealt with as part of the planning application.
- 1.26 In terms of landscape and townscape impacts, site 40539 was given a red rating, meaning that development of this land would have a significant negative impact on landscape and/or townscape which cannot be mitigated. Though the HELAA outlined that landscape impacts would be minimal, the HELAA also concluded that comprehensive development of site 40539 would have a detrimental impact on the relatively compact, linear “form of the village”. However, considering that planning approval was granted to another major development (ref: S/3543/16/FL) directly to the north of site 40539 and ‘Land to The Rear of Strawberry Farm, Pampisford Road’ (ref: S/1433/16/OL) directly south of the site, it is clear that the urban form of Great Abington is in flux, and that a “compact, linear” form is no longer an appropriate or correct description of Great Abington’s townscape.
- 1.27 Development of site 40539 would, therefore, constitute a logical extension to The Orchards development to the north and will comprise a ‘rounding off’ of the settlement of Great Abington. This would be valuable in securing sustainably located homes in close proximity to expanding employment hubs (e.g. Granta Park and the Babraham Research Campus).
- 1.28 Based on the above, it is clear that a ‘Green’ or ‘Amber’ rating would be more appropriate. We request that the HELAA be updated.

#### *Flood Risk*

- 1.29 Despite outlining that the site is situated “wholly in Flood Zone 1”, the HELAA provides an amber rating for flood risk. This flood risk rating seems inconsistent when compared to other sites that were rated green for being located wholly in Flood Zone 1 or presenting negligible flood risk (e.g. HELAA site ref: 40536).
- 1.30 In relation to surface water drainage, the site comprises a gradual slope down from the southeast to the northwest. As shown by the accompanying masterplan (see **Appendix 1**), it

is envisaged that a drainage point could be located on the north-western, lower area of the site.

- 1.31 In light of the above, a 'Green' rating would be more accurate and consistent with the grading of other sites. As such, we request that the HELAA be updated.

#### *Biodiversity and Geodiversity*

- 1.32 The assessment notes that the site is likely to be of low-to-moderate ecological value, featuring no priority habitats within the site. However, an amber rating has been given to reflect the potential impacts of the residential development on the nearby hedges and wooded boundaries. Increased visitor pressure on the nearby SSSI is also referenced.
- 1.33 However, there is little evidence to support these conclusions. Aligning with the aims of draft policy *BG/BG: Biodiversity and Geodiversity*, the proposed 6.3ha of public open space and the attenuation pond – as envisaged in the concept masterplan (see **Appendix 1**) – would benefit the wider community, contribute to the wider green infrastructure network, deliver biodiversity net gains, and mitigate against recreational pressure on the nearby SSSI.
- 1.34 Consultations with Natural England will be undertaken at the planning application stage to ascertain how ecological impacts may be reasonably mitigated and further environmental benefits may be facilitated by the development. It is also worth noting that allocation of site 40539 for development would put less pressure on the allocation of more sensitive ecological sites (e.g. sites within the green belt).
- 1.35 For these reasons, the site should be reclassified as being 'Green' in biodiversity and geodiversity terms.

#### *Archaeology*

- 1.36 During a desk-based assessment of Land South of Linton Road (ref: S/3543/16/FL) – a site immediately north of site 40539 – Cambridge County Council's Historic Environment team concluded there was low potential for any Roman or Saxon settlement remains within (or nearby) the site vicinity. Furthermore, in terms of medieval and post-medieval remains in Great Abington, the Historic Environment team concluded that there would be "low potential" within the site area as "the main focus of medieval settlement is more likely to have been concentrated within the historic core of the village, close to the church and manor house".
- 1.37 However, as the archaeological evaluation of the development site to the immediate north of site 40539 did identify evidence of flint working, an appropriate investigation strategy will be undertaken to assess the impact of development, as agreed with the Local Planning Authority.
- 1.38 Considering the above, an 'Amber' rating is appropriate in terms of archaeological impact.

#### *Site Access*

- 1.39 The site masterplan illustrates two accesses to the site: a northern access that directly links with road infrastructure within the existing The Orchards development; and a southern access that connects the site to Pampisford Road. The exact location and layout of these road accesses would be designated following a detailed transport and access study.
- 1.40 There is also potential for new pedestrian and cycle routes within the site that could be connected to the forthcoming Linton Greenway, which is planned to run adjacent to the site.



- 1.41 Despite concluding that access to the proposed site was “acceptable in principle” and that potential constraints could easily be “overcome through development”, site access only received an amber rating.
- 1.42 Considering the above comments, a ‘Green’ rating would be more accurate. We request that the HELAA be updated.

#### *Transport and Roads*

- 1.43 Vehicular access to/from site 40539 would be taken from Pampisford Road, via a new priority junction, as well as through The Orchards development to the north. As shown on the masterplan (see **Appendix 1**), there is an opportunity for new footpath/cycleway connections on the northwest corner of the site where there are existing rights of way, and a permissive path serving the allotments and routes through the Magna Close and Mortlock Gardens residential areas.
- 1.44 Furthermore, the site lies adjacent to the planned route for the Linton Greenway. The linkages to this potential pedestrian and cycle corridor can be easily accessed from site 40539 as shown on the accompanying plans. This would provide safe active travel routes to Cambridge, and easy access to major employment hubs such as Granta Park, which is situated 1.2km to the west of site along Pampisford Road, employs in excess of 3,700 people (an increase of 85% since February 2020), and has further planning permission to expand.
- 1.45 A new southern access would logically be located at about the mid-point of the southern boundary on Pampisford Road. At present, a traffic calming feature on Pampisford Road is located to the west of the proposed southern access, which is also where the 30mph speed limit starts. We suggest that both the traffic calming feature and the 30mph speed limit point are reviewed as part of the allocation of housing land in this location.

#### *Noise, Vibration, Odour, and Light Pollution*

- 1.46 Site 40539 is not located close to any significant sources of noise, vibration or odour, and there is no reason to suggest that noise, vibration, or odour mitigation measures will need to be incorporated into the development. The HELAA even concludes that the site is “capable of being developed to provide healthy internal and external environments”.
- 1.47 Based on the above, a score of ‘Green’ would be more appropriate than the current amber rating in this context and we request that the HELAA be updated.

#### *Contamination and Ground Stability*

- 1.48 Site 40539 comprises arable greenfield, so it is unlikely that significant contamination is present. Sites of this nature would normally receive a green rating in a sustainability assessment, rather than the amber rating received in the HELAA. In the event that contamination is found, this should not preclude development as any necessary conditions can be applied at the planning application stage. Therefore, we request the HELAA is updated to show a more appropriate ‘Green’ rating for contamination and ground stability.

#### *Site Density*

- 1.49 The HELAA estimates 11 dwellings per hectare, implying a low-density development. However, this figure is misleading as only c.46% of the total site area is expected to be developed for housing, with the remaining c.54% of the site being allocated as public open space and on-site drainage. Therefore, within the planned development area, a density of c. 25 dwellings per hectare would be a more accurate figure to include.

## The Proposed Policy Framework

- 1.50 The following section includes comments on the emerging policy direction as published in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals.

### *Policy S/JH: New Jobs and Homes*

- 1.51 The widespread promotion of Neighbourhood Plans (page 24) is likely to act as a constraint on development in the rural area. Research on the progress and effectiveness of neighbourhood plans<sup>1</sup> found that 55% of the draft plans published for consultation have 'protectionist' agendas and many are openly anti-development. Therefore, there is a likelihood that this agenda will create inevitable conflicts between the national aim to significantly boost housebuilding and local community NIMBYism. The idea of 'top down' housing targets being set by the local authority may also dissuade some areas from engaging with the neighbourhood planning process altogether.

### *Policy S/SB: Settlement Boundaries*

- 1.52 Although much of the Greater Cambridge area has a dispersed settlement pattern, the draft plan does not support the 'organic' growth of smaller settlements. To ensure that local housing needs can be fulfilled and prevent any further loss of key local services, a more flexible and tolerant approach is needed towards development in the rural area.
- 1.53 Through the application of tightly drawn settlement boundaries, development is strictly controlled on sites in the 'open countryside'. But it is not logical to treat all sites equally in policy terms. Although sites within sensitive valued landscapes and the green belt should receive a high level of protection, the sensitive development of some sites on the edge of a village would cause no significant harm (e.g. Great Abington). Such a pragmatic approach is often taken at appeal; rounding off development where there is a defensible physical boundary or allowing a high-quality development with extensive landscaping that would soften an existing harsh area of built form can be acceptable in certain locations.
- 1.54 Furthermore, for Group Villages such as Great Abington, the current strategy to restrict developments to an indicative maximum of 8 dwellings (or 15 dwellings where this would make the best use of a single brownfield site) within settlement boundaries will not deliver the quantum of development required to meet the existing need for affordable homes or the projected need that could follow nearby business park expansions. As a result, the affordability crisis will deepen in the rural area. For example, to deliver 25 affordable homes within Great Abington, a minimum of 63 dwellings will need to be permitted as part of major developments. With limited scope for development within the tightly drawn settlement boundary, it will be necessary to find suitable locations on the edge of the village. To discourage the development of less suitable sites and assist in the delivery of much-needed affordable housing, the most logical approach is to allocate further sites on the edge of sustainable villages such as Great Abington.
- 1.55 Overall, a carefully worded criteria-based policy which was supportive of organic growth adjacent to existing built-up areas should not perpetuate unfettered incremental growth.

---

<sup>1</sup> Turley Associates (2014). Neighbourhood Planning: Plan and Deliver?  
Available at: [www.turley.co.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/news/Turley %20Neighbourhood%20Planning\\_March\\_2014.pdf](http://www.turley.co.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/news/Turley%20Neighbourhood%20Planning_March_2014.pdf)



### *Policy CC/NZ: Net Zero Carbon New Buildings*

- 1.56 Draft Policy CC/NZ sets a high threshold of 150 homes for calculating whole life carbon emissions. Support should also be expressed for developments of <150 dwellings where this information is provided voluntarily.
- 1.57 What support will be available for developers in seeking to meet the high standards proposed? Will the potential impact on viability be taken into consideration? Regardless of the chosen approach, it would be useful to include further guidance/information in a supplementary planning document (SPD).

### *Policy CC/WE: Water Efficiency in New Developments*

- 1.58 What support will be available for developers in seeking to meet the high standards proposed? Will the potential impact on viability be taken into consideration? Regardless of the chosen approach, it would be useful to include further guidance/information in an SPD.

### *Policy BG/GI: Green Infrastructure*

- 1.59 The adoption of a green infrastructure standard should be a recommendation, not a requirement. Developments should not be opposed where all reasonable steps have been taken to protect and incorporate green infrastructure.
- 1.60 Regardless of the chosen approach, it would be useful to include further guidance/information in an SPD.

### *Policy WS/HD: Creating Healthy New Developments*

- 1.61 Health Impact Assessments should be a requirement for major developments only. For minor developments, this information should be optional or simplified, for example through the use of a short questionnaire (similar to the Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Checklist).

### *Policy GP/PP: People and Place Responsive Design and Policy GP/QD: Achieving High-quality Development*

- 1.62 It is accepted that good design is highly subjective. However, the planning system has allowed the steady homogenisation of built environments, with a dominance of bland, monotonous "identikit" housing estates from major housebuilders.
- 1.63 The bold ambitions of draft policy GP/PP are supported, particularly the proposed use of design Guides/Codes to set out the design expectations for a particular area. Local community input will also be as stated, and a robust consultation process will be needed since the 'devil will be in the detail'; these documents must go well beyond broad requirements for new homes to be 'in keeping' with the character and appearance of the area.
- 1.64 However, it will take time for these design guides to be drafted and adopted. In the interim, developers could be signposted towards an alternative framework, such as the National Design Guide, which includes 10 characteristics of a well-designed place: context, identity, built form, movement, nature, public spaces, uses, homes and buildings, resources, and lifespan. Developments which can demonstrate a high standard of design should be fast-tracked through the application process.

- 1.65 Additional measures should be introduced for strategic scale development to avoid monotony. For example, the policy could introduce a minimum number of individual house types, appropriate to the scale of development.

*Policy H/AH: Affordable Housing*

- 1.66 The First Proposals plan sets a challenging target for affordable housing to reflect the acute and substantial need for affordable housing across Greater Cambridge. This places a great responsibility on all major developments to provide an element of affordable housing.
- 1.67 Policy H/AH will have a significant bearing on the viability of individual residential developments, so it is vital that the affordable housing requirement is achievable in practice. Although the First Proposals plan indicates that viability evidence will be reviewed as appropriate as part of the plan-making process, this is not sufficient. Planning Practice Guidance indicates that plans should set out circumstances where review mechanisms may be appropriate, as well as a clear process and terms of engagement regarding how and when viability will be reassessed over the lifetime of a development to ensure policy compliance and optimal public benefits through economic cycles. Draft Policy H/AH does not do this – changes in affordable housing tenure models or continued increases in build costs may render the viability evidence which underpins the affordable housing requirement out-of-date relatively quickly.
- 1.68 In relation to the development of Land North of Pampisford Road in Great Abington, “a demonstrable need for affordable housing in Great Abington and Little Abington” was outlined by the Planning Committee when reviewing The Orchards development directly north of site 40539 (see *S/3543/16/FL Great Abington Report*). Recent analyses of local property market dynamics indicate that affordable housing demands are still a focal concern for local authorities across the Greater Cambridge area. According to recent housing needs projections, an annual net need of 435 affordable rental units and 105 affordable units for homeownership<sup>2</sup> will be needed across South Cambridgeshire to satisfy housing demands. Indeed, these projections do not account for local variegation in housing needs, which may be higher for conurbations closer to epicentres of business growth (e.g. Great Abington). This is concerning as there are no allocations for residential development in the adopted Local Plan and no proposed allocations in Great Abington as part of the emerging GCLP. Dependence on the allocation of strategic sites with already high infrastructure burdens is unlikely to offer sustainable, long-term solutions to the chronic and worsening affordability issues manifesting across the Greater Cambridge area. Strategic sites alone do not deliver policy-compliant levels of affordable housing, so, if this is the target, more smaller sites that are far more likely to deliver a policy-compliant level of affordable homes at a faster rate need to be allocated.
- 1.69 Draft Policy H/AH of the First Proposals plan requires 40% affordable housing on sites of 10 or more dwellings. With a total of 135 dwellings proposed on **Site 40539**, 54 would be sought for affordable housing under this policy (of which at least 14 will be allocated as ‘First Homes’ under the national First Homes initiative). As well as helping to address the current shortage of affordable housing over the Greater Cambridge area, the delivery of up to 54 affordable dwellings would represent a significant positive for the social sustainability of the local area.

*Policy H/CB: Self- and Custom-build Homes*

- 1.70 The proposed policy approach will require continual updating of the self and custom build register(s) to reflect the permissions that have been granted with a self- or custom-build element. Close monitoring on sales and completions will also be necessary in case plots

---

<sup>2</sup> GL Hearn (2021). Housing Needs of Specific Groups: Cambridgeshire and West Suffolk. Available at: <https://cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk>

earmarked for self- or custom-build revert to market dwellings at the end of the prescribed 12-month marketing period.

- 1.71 It is also unclear if the current registers for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire are to be combined, with delivery of plots across the wider area. This would not be logical since many prospective self-builders will have preferred locations and few will have a search area as wide as Greater Cambridge. A more focused policy, perhaps split across the two administrative areas, would encourage the development of self-build plots in the right locations to meet local demand. For example, if all the need for plots was in and around Cambridge, it would not make sense to burden developers in other parts of the area.

### Availability and Deliverability

- 1.72 The First Proposals plan is heavily reliant on the delivery of a handful of strategic developments, particularly large and complex sites which, on average, would take 5–8 years for the first home to be delivered<sup>3</sup>. To ensure that housing delivery does not stall, and the affordability crisis worsened as a result, a pipeline of smaller developments which can deliver homes quickly will be needed in the short-to-medium term. Site 40539, Land North of Pampisford Road in Great Abington is suitable, available, and it can begin to be deliverable, as phased development within 0–5 years.

---

<sup>3</sup> Lichfields (2020). Start to Finish: What Factors Affect the Build-out Rates of Large-scale Housing Sites? Second Edition