

Greater Cambridge Local Plan 2024–2045

Regulation 18 Consultation December 2025 – January 2026

Land to the north and east of Barrington Road, Foxton

Representations on behalf of R2 Developments Ltd.

Date: January 2026 | Pegasus Ref: P20-2706



Contents.

1. Introduction.....	1
2. A Sustainable Location.....	2
3. Landscape and Green Belt Matters.....	3
4. Flood Risk.....	4
5. Ecology.....	4
6. Access.....	5
7. Summary.....	5
8. Deliverability	6
9. Housing Need: Policy S/JH: New jobs and homes	6
10. Policy S/SH: Settlement hierarchy and Policy S/DE: Defined development extents.....	9
11. Policy S/GB: The Cambridge Green Belt.....	10

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Our client, R2 Developments Ltd., supports the aims of the emerging Local Plan to minimise carbon emissions and reliance on the private car by creating thriving neighbourhoods with the variety of jobs and homes and supporting infrastructure needed for Greater Cambridge. However, the Councils' strategy needs to allow for greater flexibility with a recognition of the role that sites physically well related to well-connected railway station can play in achieving these aims. This is of greater importance now that the proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seek to promote such sites. Should the proposed changes in the NPPF be adopted unchanged, then the decision making policies would be material considerations in the determinations of applications. Accordingly, the purpose of these representations is primarily to respond to the emerging Vision; Development Strategy; and Draft Allocations proposed by Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP) Regulation 18 consultation.
- 1.2. Our client has been promoting their site 'Land to the north and east of Barrington Road, Foxton' (HELAA Site ID (2023) 40412 -Site ID 115891) through previous call for sites as a logical and deliverable site to be allocated for a residential development of circa 60-90 dwellings. The site was first assessed by the Councils in 2021. And then again in 2025. In the time that has passed our client has continued to progress technical and design work and is now in a position to update their Call for Sites submission. This submission also seeks to reaffirm the deliverability of the site and highlight the need for a revision to the green belt to support a site-specific policy that allocates the site for a residential development in the emerging Local Plan.
- 1.3. The allocation of the site would result in the following benefits:
 - Up to 90 dwellings including a range of different dwelling types in a sustainable location within walking distance of a well-connected rail station within the A10 corridor, which has been identified as accommodating significant employment growth
 - Provision of affordable housing, in accordance with the Council's policy to deliver a balanced community that would be well integrated into the scheme and enhance social cohesion whilst meeting some of the local housing needs of the village
 - A flexible site that can be designed with an internal network of streets that would promote walking and cycling as the most appropriate means of travelling through the site and accessing nearby services and facilities including Foxton rail station
 - A flexible site that can be designed with SUDs integrated into the final design of the development ensuring that no new or existing properties would be at risk of flooding
 - The ability to deliver significant landscape buffers on the northeastern edge of what is already a well screened and enclosed site to provide a defensible edge to the adjacent green belt
 - Environmental enhancements that would deliver significant gains in biodiversity through the creation of new habitats on site



- 1.4. The following sections respond to the previous HELAA appraisals of the site in the context of the changes to national planning policy that have been implemented and are proposed.

2. A Sustainable Location

- 2.1. The proposed changes to the NPPF include draft Policy S5, which would establish 'in principle' support – a "default yes" – for suitable proposals that develop land around rail stations within existing settlements, and around 'well-connected' train stations outside settlements, including on green belt land. Draft Policy L3 would require minimum densities of 40 dwellings per hectare around all stations, with an increase to 50 dwellings per hectare around 'well-connected' stations.
- 2.2. The government proposes to define 'well-connected' station as one which is:
- located within the top 60 Travel to Work Areas (which are located partially or fully within England), by Gross Value Added
 - with a service frequency (in the normal weekday timetable) of four trains or trams per hour overall, or two trains per hour in any one direction
- 2.3. Being within the catchment of London, Foxtton station is located within the largest Travel to Work Area. At peak times Foxtton station has two trains per hour in the direction of London, and two in the direction of Cambridge. The entirety of the site is within 800 metres of the station, which means it is likely to be considered within "reasonable walking distance" of it.
- 2.4. There is a high level of probability that the draft NPPF will result in policies S5 and L3 becoming part of the national planning policy. Therefore, it is essential that the emerging Local Plan acknowledges that sites like our client's are likely to come forward as planning applications and takes the opportunity to positively plan for them by allocating them through the Local Plan process.
- 2.5. The level of local services, transport and employment services within the area remain largely the same as when previous HELAA assessments were carried out. The Councils have consistently acknowledged that the site has good accessibility to these services. In addition to existing employment sites in Foxtton and the surrounding villages, the emerging Local Plan proposes the redevelopment of land adjacent to Cambridge Road (A10) and Mill Lane, Hauxton for 2,000 square metres of office (Class E(g)(i)), research and development (Class E(g)(ii)), and light industrial (Class E(g)(iii)) floorspace through draft Policy S/RRA/CRH. Draft Policy S/RRA/CR also proposes approximately 8,000 square metres of floorspace for employment uses at land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn. Both of these sites are within cycling distance of our client's site. Our client is also promoting the site 'Land to the south-east of Cambridge Road, Foxtton' (HELAA Site ID 40408 -Site ID 115890) for 12,500 square metres of employment floorspace. These emerging employment developments are in addition to the redevelopment of the Burlington Park site on Station Road, Foxtton, that was approved in April 2023 (ref: 22/O3826/FUL).
- 2.6. By designating Foxtton as a Group Village it has been identified as one of the more sustainable rural settlements in the District. Unlike other Group Villages, Foxtton also benefits from excellent public transport connectivity with London and Cambridge. The Melbourn Greenway also provides cycle connectivity with employment sites at Melbourn to the southwest and employment sites at Hauxton and Cambridge to the northeast. Which

include the biomedical campus at Addenbrookes. This growth in jobs is not matched by proposed allocations for new homes. Indeed, the Councils' strategy for accommodating new homes on the edges of Cambridge and new settlements to the north and west of the district means that there are very few new homes proposed for the rest of the rural area, including the A10 corridor.

- 2.7. Notwithstanding the proposed changes to the NPPF, the proposed employment growth along the A10 corridor would support the aims of the established hierarchy of settlements by focusing growth on one of the most sustainable Group Villages in the district. One with excellent public transport and cycle connectivity. Successive Local Plans have recognised the need for new homes to be accommodated near to existing public transport infrastructure. The proposed changes to the NPPF take this further with the likelihood of a default yes for sites such as our client's well related to rail stations.
- 2.8. Other allocations are predicated on the delivery of new or enhanced public infrastructure for them to be acceptable. There is an inherent risk in such a strategy with delays already seen with the relocation of the station for Waterbeach new town and the Cambourne to Cambridge Bus Route that will serve Cambourne and Bourn Airfield. Therefore, great weight must be attached to the delivery of new homes within reasonable walking distance of established, well-connected public transport hubs. The approach to maximising opportunities for sustainable development by making the most of high levels of connectivity and improving access to jobs and services must therefore be a key theme of the Councils' proposals to accommodate growth in the most sustainable locations. Draft Policy GP/HD recognises the need to focus development on sites well served by existing high quality public transport. This draft policy would further support the site coming forward as an application, ideally, in parallel with an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.

3. Landscape and Green Belt Matters

- 3.1. The Councils' 2021 assessment of the landscape impact acknowledges that wide views of the site are limited. However, based on local views, that are considered high due to boundary vegetation, development of the site was judged to have a significant adverse impact upon landscape character. The impact of development in the green belt has changed significantly since the 2021 assessment. Specifically, due to the 2024 changes to the NPPF and the introduction of 'grey belt' land as a concept for permitting development in sustainable locations within green belts.
- 3.2. Grey Belt is defined in the NPPF as "land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case does not strongly contribute to any of purposes a), b) or d) in paragraph 143". Grey belt excludes land where the application of policies relating the areas or assets in footnote 7 would provide a strong reason for refusal.
- 3.3. Our client has undertaken an initial assessment of the site, in addition to a Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) carried out in 2021. The site does not check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another or preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Based on these assessments, there is a strong argument that the site meets the definition of 'grey belt' with regards to the contribution it makes towards the purposes of the green belt.
- 3.4. Following further assessment, our client is confident that they can demonstrated that the site does not contribute strongly to any of purposes of green belt set out in the NPPF. As



such, there is a high degree of probability that a successful argument could be made that the site comprises grey belt land.

- 3.5. Given the existing properties to the north, east and south, there are only two relatively short boundaries that offer views into the site from the east and west. To the south the site has an open frontage that is bound by Barrington Road. However, this frontage has to be seen in the context of Cambridge Road and the built-up area to the southeast of it. Rather than having a significant impact upon landscape character, any development on the two Barrington Road frontages would in effect be seen as infilling the gaps between existing properties. Indeed, there is already development and landscaping to the west of Barrington Road that would limit views from the west. The open boundary to the northeast of the site would inevitably become a landscaped buffer to visually enclose the land parcel. Again, further to additional assessments being carried out, it is likely that an updated LVIA would demonstrate that the development of the site would not result in any significant adverse impact upon landscape character.
- 3.6. The proposed changes to the NPPF will inevitably create opportunities for the development of land within our client's site. Whilst limited developments of 8 dwellings are permitted within the development frameworks of Group Villages, this threshold should not be applied to sites like our client's. For larger sites a more holistic approach to how the land is developed would result in greater benefits in terms of delivering a more strategic approach to the boundary landscaping and the provision of market and affordable housing within walking distance of a well-connected rail station.
- 3.7. Prior to preparing a layout plan for the site our client has been carrying out further investigations. These are primarily focused on identifying whether there are any archaeological assets of high significance that may require preservation in situ. Whilst these could potentially constrain development on part of the site, it is likely that there would still be opportunities for development of the site.

4. Flood Risk

- 4.1. The most recent Flood Risk Officer's comments confirm that the site is wholly in Flood Zone 1. Limited areas of the site are identified as being at risk of surface water flooding. The limited impact of surface water flooding across parts of the site is a known constraint that would inform the layout of the site. Given the size of the site and the density of development proposed, there is the opportunity to deliver an integrated approach to water management with surface water drainage being managed close to its source. A SUDs network could be integrated into any layout in a way that would create amenity benefits, enhance biodiversity, and contribute to a network of high-quality green and blue open space across the site for the benefit of new and existing residents. Development would inevitably be sequentially located within the site to avoid any homes or road infrastructure being located in areas of flood risk.

5. Ecology

- 5.1. The 2021 RAG Assessment of 'amber' for Biodiversity and Geodiversity appears to be based on the potential for increased pressure on a nearby SSSI. Given that the majority of the site comprises intensively farmed agricultural land, there should be no reason why through an enhancement of existing landscape features a significant increase in biodiversity could not

be achieved. Through the provision of landscaped buffers there is also the opportunity to integrate a dog walking route around the perimeter of the site so that new and existing residents had a recreational route near their homes. Which could then mitigate any impacts upon the nearby SSSI. Whilst our client has concerns about the implications of the proposed blanket requirement of 20% BNG across all major developments proposed by draft Policy BG/BG, in the case of their site, it is likely that the Councils' aspiration for 20% BNG could be achieved and even exceeded.

- 5.2. Throughout the Councils' assessment of the site the Policy Officer has confirmed that the site is not part of a protected open space designation and that any impact of the proposed development could be reasonably mitigated or compensated. That remains the case.
- 5.3. In allocating the site for development there is the opportunity to secure the beneficial use of a site that is likely to be identified as grey belt land. The allocation could also secure environmental enhancements that would create a more defined, stronger eastern boundary to this part of the village that would not cause harm to the openness of the adjacent land remaining in the green belt.

6. Access

- 6.1. In the 2025 assessment the Councils confirm that the site has adequate accessibility to key local services, transport and employment opportunities. As identified above, these employment opportunities are likely to increase with approved and proposed employment sites being developed within walking and cycling distance of the site.
- 6.2. The Site Access Officer confirms that the proposed site access is likely to be acceptable in principle subject to detailed design. An access onto the southern section of Barrington Road would inevitably allow for cyclists and pedestrians to have greater connectivity with the Greenway and the crossing to access the station. There is no reason to believe that the creation of an acceptable access onto Barrington Road would represent a constraint to the development of the site.
- 6.3. All other technical matters related to ground contamination, air quality, noise, etc. are either identified as 'green' or 'amber' in previous assessments. There is no reason to believe that any of these matters would represent a constraint to the development of the site.

7. Summary

- 7.1. The development of our client's site would help support the vitality of Foxton through new homes being delivered in a location with access to the rail station and services and facilities at the heart of the village. Importantly, these homes could be delivered early on in the plan period so that less reliance was needed on the delivery of homes proposed through the increased reliance on strategic scale residential sites. The employment opportunities along the A10 corridor are set to increase with the aforementioned employment and commercial allocations in the emerging Local Plan and the redevelopment of the Burlington Park site. This strengthens the argument that Foxton is a sustainable location to focus future housing growth. Especially on a site that is within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected rail station. And where there is every indication that new homes can be accommodated without significant harm to the character of the village or the green belt.

- 7.2. In this case, there is a strong argument that the allocation of our client's site offers an opportunity to deliver a holistic approach to the development of the parcel of land to the northeast of the village. Given the proposed changes to the NPPF and the potential for a default 'yes' for sites well-related to rail stations, it is inevitable that the site will be developed in the future. Through taking a holistic approach to growth in this part of the village, and the development of our client's site in particular, the Councils have the opportunity to enhance the area through the creation a new landscaped boundary. One that would define a new and defensible green belt boundary by creating a continuous landscaped edge to the village and limit views of new homes on the site.
- 7.3. Once further assessments have been carried out, it is likely that our client will be able to demonstrate that their site performs poorly against the purposes of green belt as set out in the NPPF. Since the site was originally promoted, in the early stages of the Local Plan process, the concept of grey belt has become part of national planning policy and is one of the means by which the government seeks to significantly boost the supply of homes in sustainable locations in accordance with paragraph 61 of the NPPF. This significant shift in the national policy to permit more development on sites like our client's means that the development strategy for the Greater Cambridge must be reassessed. With the proposed changes to the NPPF, a further shift in national policy is likely to take place with sites well related to rail stations effectively benefitting from a presumption in favour of development.
- 7.4. These changes warrant a further review and assessment of the acceptability of the site and the important role it can play in delivering new homes needed for the Greater Cambridge Area.

8. Deliverability

- 8.1. In terms of delivery, an estimated 48-month completion period, following allocation in an adopted Local Plan and the subsequent approval of all necessary planning applications, is realistic. This means that the new homes could be deliver in the early years of the new Local Plan.

Specific policy comments

9. Housing Need: Policy S/JH: New jobs and homes

- 9.1. The 'Greater Cambridge Employment and Housing Needs Updated 2024-2025 (September 2025)' has informed the housing needs for Greater Cambridge for the period 2024-2045. These needs and the assessment, which broadly aligns with the standard methodology, result in a strategy of 2,295 new homes being delivered per annum to achieve a minimum of 48,195 new homes over the plan period. Of these new homes the Councils' adopted Local Plans (2018) are anticipated to deliver around 37,865 homes by 2045. The additional 13,460 new homes are to be delivered through proposed allocations, heavily predicated on strategic sites, and windfalls sites. Whilst the projected figures would provide an appropriate buffer, there are concerns about the strategy that is being proposed to meet the identified needs and whether it is truly deliverable. There are also concerns about the location of new development and the fact that the majority of the new homes would be delivered by way of new settlements to the north and west of Cambridge. This strategy

ignores the employment growth along the A10 corridor and the need to ensure that new homes are located near to sites where new employment opportunities are planned.

- 9.2. The government's growth aspirations for Greater Cambridge are well documented with the Cambridge Growth Company (CGC) being set up to promote and accelerate growth in the area. The CGC is yet to publish any plans for how it will deliver the government's growth aspirations and what levels of growth it is seeking to promote. It is clear that in order to deliver the growth needs for Greater Cambridge a balance is needed to ensure that delivery rates do not stall due to issues related to specific sites being delayed in their planning or build out phases. This has happened with a number of the sites identified in the 2018 Local Plans, which have failed to deliver the new homes anticipated when they were allocated. It is also clear that given the government's aspirations for Greater Cambridge there is a strong justification for adopting a higher growth scenario than envisioned in the emerging Local Plan. This would also have an implication for the number of new homes proposed to support this growth in locations where new jobs would be created.
- 9.3. Whilst the proposed allocations would deliver a five-year supply of housing, there should be aspiration for a more ambitious target to meet the government's growth targets. This can be achieved through the allocation of further sites on locations where changes to the NPPF make it inevitable that they will otherwise come forward as speculative applications.

10. Housing Supply: Policy S/DS: Development strategy

- 10.1. Our client supports the principle of focussing development in the most sustainable locations and note that this is identified 'as far as possible' in draft Policy S/DS (Development strategy). Due to site specific issues that may presently be unknown, it may not always be possible for sites allocated for being in the most sustainable locations to come forward. Therefore, the ability to accommodate the growth needs of the Greater Cambridge area around and within Cambridge itself and at the new settlements must be treated with a degree of caution. Moreover, the geographical distribution of new homes ignores the growth in jobs that will take place along the A10 corridor. The emerging Local Plan needs to allow for greater flexibility for interim growth needs to be located on sites well-located to established travel hubs, such as at our client's site at Foxton. Without a more balanced approach to meeting future housing needs, both in terms of interim delivery and geographical locations, there is a risk that Greater Cambridge will fail to deliver the homes it needs within the plan period. Homes that it is essential are located near to the employment sites that will support the economic growth aspirations of Greater Cambridge.
- 10.2. Paragraph 23 of the NPPF requires strategic policies to provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period. In accordance with paragraph 77 d) of the NPPF, the Councils must make a realistic assessment of likely rates of delivery and take into account the lead-in times for large scale sites. Based on uncertainties surrounding the delivery of Cambridge East and the rate at which Eddington can be delivered, our client is concerned about the rate at which new homes can come forward in the short to medium term. This therefore leads our client to question the development strategy set out in the emerging Local Plan.
- 10.3. The strategy for growth in the emerging Local Plan is predicated on a higher percentage of new homes being delivered through new settlements and urban extensions than was the

case with previous Local Plans (44% presently proposed compared to 23% in the adopted Local Plans and 18% in the previous Structure Plan). The withdrawal of funding to relocate the CWWTP and allow North East Cambridge to come forward highlights the risks with this strategy. Whilst the Councils' projections are not reliant on North East Cambridge, the strategy still relies on other strategic sites that have histories of failing to deliver. Given the significant number of homes to be delivered on larger sites, towards the end of the plan period, the proposed contingency should be higher to ensure that any delays in homes coming forward on larger sites do not stall growth.

- 10.4. Cambridge East is another site where any further development opportunities are predicated on a third party vacating the site. However, in this case the Councils are taking less of a precautionary approach. Given the well documented history of Marshalls' attempts to relocate their aerospace operations, and the recent announcement that they will not be moving to Cranfield, the projections for further homes on Cambridge East coming forward cannot be relied upon. The development of Marleigh and the land north of Cherry Hinton (Springstead Village) represent the maximum number of homes that can be delivered whilst the airport remains operational. The determination of the outline application for Marleigh (then known as Wing) highlighted the complexities of Marshall relocating its various businesses. Importantly, the cost implications of works to facilitate the relocation of Marhsall Group businesses triggered a viability review that reduced the percentage of affordable housing and prolonged the planning process. Until plans for the development of Cambridge East align with the commercial needs of Marshalls, the company is unlikely to relocate the airport.
- 10.5. Whilst further development at Eddington would maximise the development potential of the site, housing delivery has lagged behind other fringe sites. Outline planning permission was granted for North West Cambridge in February 2013 for a mixed use development including 3,000 homes. By the time the period had expired for the submission of reserved matters applications for residential development, detailed plans for approximately 1,800 of these homes had been approved. Therefore, projections for increased housing delivery through the intensification of the site must be realistic and be based on empirical evidence of historic build out rates.
- 10.6. The significant delays in the grant of outline planning permission for Bourn Airfield demonstrates the complexities of strategic sites and the length of time they take to go through planning. The outline application was submitted in September 2018 but not approved until July 2024. Whilst this delay was not foreseen, it highlights the complexities of strategic sites in securing planning permissions. Which further highlights the need for more sites that can add to the vitality and housing needs of villages to be allocated for development to meet the interim housing needs of Greater Cambridge. Sites, such as our client's, that do not have the complexities of strategic sites.
- 10.7. Of the 13,463 homes identified for the period 2024–2045 only 205 of these would be accommodated in the rural area outside the southern cluster. Given the availability of sites such as our client's, which can be delivered without the need for major infrastructure upgrades, more flexibility needs to be provided through further allocations to mitigate delays that are inevitable with strategic sites.
- 10.8. In January 2026 the Office for National Statistics released the quarterly figures for the monthly construction output statistics for Great Britain. Total construction output is estimated to have fallen by 1.1% in the three months to November 2025; this is the largest

fall since March 2023 (1.4% fall). This latest report highlights the precarious situation that the construction industry is in with increasing material prices and decreasing numbers of people entering the industry. This adds further weight to the argument that a greater range of development sites are needed to meet future housing needs. Rather than relying on larger sites that may face more challenges in getting the volumes of materials and staff needed to maintain projected build out rates.

- 10.9. Without more flexibility and a greater balance between strategic and medium sized sites, the Councils risk failing to maintain a sufficient supply of new homes in the early years of the Local Plan. That could result in the inability to defend appeals for sites in less desirable and less sustainable locations than our client's site at Foxtan.

11. Policy S/SH: Settlement hierarchy and Policy S/DE: Defined development extents

- 11.1. Focusing development only within the defined development extents of settlements is inconsistent with the proposed changes to the NPPF by way of draft Policy S5. The changes propose a more flexible approach to the location of development with weight given to sites that are well-related to existing settlements and well-connected rail stations. If the Councils were to adopt a more flexible approach to the development of sites well related to defined development extents and well-connected rail stations, it would result in greater opportunities for the 6,976 new homes identified to come through on windfall sites to be delivered.
- 11.2. Defined development extents do not necessarily guard against incremental growth in unsustainable locations. Indeed, new homes in demonstrably sustainable locations can be restricted from coming forward due to locations being just outside defined development extents of highly sustainable settlements. Or where they are within reasonable walking distances of established public transport routes. Such as Foxtan rail station. Where any harm to the countryside can be mitigated through landscaping and design, such sites should not be restricted in coming forward if they can demonstrate sustainable development. The Councils' approach is not consistent with the proposed changes to the NPPF, which takes a more pragmatic approach to allowing appropriate development where it is well located to existing settlements and public transport infrastructure. This is clearly the direction of travel that the government is taking to significantly boost the supply of new homes in accordance with paragraph 61 of the NPPF.

Recommended change: part 5 of Policy S/SH needs to be amended to read *"Residential development and redevelopment without any limit on individual scheme size will be permitted within the defined development extents, and on land well-related to defined development extents and within reasonable walking distance of well-connected rail stations, as defined on the Policies Map, provided that adequate services, facilities and infrastructure are available or can be made available as a result of the development."*

Recommended change: part 1 of Policy S/DE needs to be amended to read *"Development and redevelopment of unallocated land and buildings within defined development extents, and on land well-related to the defined development extents and within reasonable walking distance of well-connected rail stations, (as shown on the Policies Map) will be permitted provided that:"*

12. Policy S/GB: The Cambridge Green Belt

- 12.1. The government's initial reforms of the NPPF in December 2024 included a modernisation of the way the green belt works. This included the consideration of development being permitted on low-quality green belt land that is identified as 'grey belt'. An initial assessment of our client's site at Foxton indicates that it is likely to be classed as grey belt, as it performs poorly against the purposes of green belt in the NPPF.
- 12.2. Given the importance of grey belt land in the government achieving its aim of significantly boosting the supply of new homes, greater flexibility is needed for more homes to come forward on sites that are well related to well-connected rail stations. Our client's site meets these criteria, as well as having excellent cycle connectivity with existing and proposed employment sites along the A10 corridor and at Cambridge.
- 12.3. In light of the significant changes to national policy with regards to development within the green belt, there is the need for the Councils to undertake a thorough green belt review as part of the Local Plan process. This is essential to ensure that the development strategy for Greater Cambridge is based on a sound assessment of the strategy allocating more sites nearer to Cambridge and new jobs. It is inconceivable that the development strategy for an area so tightly constrained by green belt is not supported by an up to date review of the green belt, and the contributions that land parcels within it make to its purposes.
- 12.4. Whilst Policy S/GB follows the themes of the NPPF there is one clear area of divergence. That is in criterion c), which seeks to "*prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the city*". Criterion b) of paragraph 143 of the NPPF relates to preventing neighbouring 'towns' merging into one another. As the environs surrounding Cambridge are villages, draft Policy S/GB needs to be consistent with the NPPF.

Recommended change: criterion c), of Policy S/GB needs to be amended to read "*prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging with the city.*"

Further recommendation: That a comprehensive review of the green belt be carried out to identify further sites for development in sustainable locations that can be delivered without harm to the purposes of land being designated as green belt.

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, GL7 1RQ
We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001



[Pegasus_Group](#)



[pegasusgroup](#)



[Pegasus_Group](#)

PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK