

Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan 2024-2045

Comments on behalf of Martin Grant Land Limited

Land at Silverdale Close, Coton

Policy S/DS: Development Strategy

- 1.1. These representations have been prepared by Stantec on behalf of Martin Grant Land Limited (formerly Martin Grant Homes) pursuant to their land interests at Silverdale Close, Coton. The site has been assessed within the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment 2025 (HELAA). The Site ID is 115148 and the HELAA Site ID is 40079.
- 1.2. These representations provide updated information regarding the site, and should be read in conjunction with the following submissions:
 - Call for Sites March 2019
 - Regulation 18 Issues and Options February 2020
 - Regulation 18 First Proposals December 2021
 - Call for Sites Submission Update March 2025
- 1.3. Policy S/DS sets out the main strategic development sites for both residential and employment development through to 2045. This includes carrying over previous sites, whilst also introducing two new large scale housing allocations, with 13,000 homes at Cambourne North and 6,000 homes at Grange Farm proposed (although not all to be delivered in the plan period).
- 1.4. There has been a history of the Council relying upon large scale development in order to meet the necessary housing numbers. This is particularly the case within South Cambridgeshire District Council, where sites such as Northstowe, Waterbeach, and Bourn Airfield were all allocated within the 2018 Local Plan if not earlier.
- 1.5. Whilst the principle of further strategic allocations (at Cambourne North and Grange Farm) is accepted, it is imperative these sites are appropriately supplemented by a sufficient number of smaller allocations to ensure housing delivery rates are in line with housing need.
- 1.6. The table below sets out some of the difficulties in reliance upon strategic sites allocated in the adopted 2018 Local Plans, and shows the timelines involved in getting planning permission and completions. The information is taken from the Greater Housing Trajectory and Housing Land Supply Report (April 2025).

Site	No. of Dwellings	Original App Reference	Valid Date for Outline	Date of Outline Permission	No. of Completions at March 24
Bourn Airfield	3,500	S/3440/18/OL	10-9-18	30-7-24	0
Cambourne West	2,350	S/2903/14/OL	22-12-14	29-12-17	556
Darwin Green 1	1,593	07/0003/OUT	19-12-06	18-12-13	331
Eddington	3,000	11/1114/OUT & S/1886/11	22-9-11	22-2-13	1,121
Northstowe Phase 1	1,500	S/0388/12/OL	27-2-12	22-4-14	1,401
Northstowe Phase 2	3,500	S/2011/14/OL	29-8-14	9-1-17	79
Northstowe Phase 3a	4,000	20/02171/OUT	18-5-20	25-3-22	0
Northstowe phase 3b	1,000	20/02142/OUT	7-5-20	25-3-22	0
Waterbeach New Town - West	6,500	S/0559/17/OL	17-2-17	27-9-19	25
Waterbeach New Town - East	4,500	S/2075/18/OL	30-5-18	17-12-24	0

Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan 2024-2045

- 1.7. The table shows the difficulty and time required for strategic sites to deliver homes within Greater Cambridge. Northstowe Phase 1 for example was validated at outline stage in February 2012. By March 2024 (a period of 12 years), it had only delivered 1,401 of the 1,500 expected. At Eddington (Phase 1), 13 years after the outline was validated, only 1,121 out of 3,000 dwellings have been completed and the outline application has now lapsed. At Bourn Airfield, no reserved matters application for residential development have been submitted as yet, over 7 years after the validation of the original outline.
- 1.8. The result of this is that the Council face the danger of not being able to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply through the plan period. Following the publication of the Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Housing Land Supply Report April 2025, the Greater Cambridge authority claim to have a combined 5.5 year supply of housing. However, an analysis of the evidence suggests this figure is likely to be below 5 years.
- 1.9. The development strategy should therefore include smaller sites to supplement the strategic allocations and guarantee delivery in the early part of the plan period. Sites such as Silverdale Close, Coton can provide 80 dwellings in a sustainable location to be delivered fully within the first five years of the plan. The site remains suitable, immediately available and achievable.
- 1.10. Paragraph 83 of the NPPF (2024) confirms that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive. The lack of allocations within villages, relying on low levels of windfall within settlements, again fails this requirement of the NPPF. Only the village of Melbourn (two sites) and Sawston (on a site that already benefits from planning permission) have smaller scale draft allocations outside of the city or major strategic sites.
- 1.11. South Cambridgeshire is a rural district with over 100 villages. Of these, only two villages stand to benefit from a housing allocation. Paragraph 2.70 of the draft Local Plan states that villages 'should play only a limited role in meeting future development needs'. It is suggested that three sites within over 100 villages is significantly less than a limited role. The aims and objectives of NPPF paragraph 83 are clearly not therefore being met, to the detriment of the villages.
- 1.12. Paragraph 2.41 of the draft Local Plan confirms that the proposed North East Cambridge development that requires the relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) does not form part of the housing requirement, and if it were to come forward, then it would provide additional 'headroom' beyond the minimum housing figure. At present, the project to relocate the WWTP does not benefit from the required funding given the Governments decision in August 2025 to not commit the additional funding required. The draft Local Plan at paragraph 2.85 sets out what needs to be in terms of waste water capacity given the new facility not coming forward. The Council cannot therefore be reliant upon housing development at North East Cambridge, and any potential headroom at this stage shall be afforded little weight given the uncertainty as to whether the site will ever come forward. As such, table 3 within the policy seems unnecessary and should be deleted accordingly.