Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options Assessment

Supplement

On behalf of **Greater Cambridge Shared Planning**

GREATER CAMBRIDGE
SHARED PLANNING

Project Ref: 48280 | Rev: A | Date August 2021

Registered Office: Buckingham Court Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, HP11 1JU
Office Address: 78 Link House, Cowcross Street, London, EC1M 6EJ
T: +44 (0)203 824 6600

Document Control Sheet

Project Name: **Infrastructure Delivery Plan Supplement**

Project Ref: **48280**

Report Title: **Greater Cambridge Local Plan strategic spatial options assessment**

Doc Ref: **1**

Date: **August 2021**

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Robert Nairn/ Jack Smith/ Stuart Langer	Planner/Transport planner/ Principal Planner (LUC)	RN/SL	20 Aug 21
Reviewed by:	Andrew Lynch	Associate	AL	26 Aug 21
Approved by:	Cristina Howick	Director	CH	13 Sep 21
For and on behalf of Stantec UK Limited				

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
A	26 Aug 21	Draft for review	RN/SL	AL	CH
B	27th Aug 21	Final	AL	AL	CH
C	13th Sep 21	Final with minor corrections	CH	CH	CH

Contents

Appendices

1 Introduction

This Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options Assessment: Infrastructure Delivery Plan Supplement Report assesses with regard to all forms of infrastructure, the working assumption Greater Cambridge Local Plan preferred option development strategy, and a new blended Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt alternative, in the same way as was completed for the strategic spatial options in November 2020.

Alongside other evidence assessments and Sustainability Appraisal, consideration of the preferred option and Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt alternative alongside the strategic spatial options assessments ensures consideration of a range of reasonable alternative strategies.

1.1 Context

For the strategic spatial options stage, we completed assessments of the three growth levels and eight strategic spatial options.

Further to this, ahead of the Preferred Options Plan consultation taking place in autumn 2021, officers from Greater Cambridge Shared Planning on behalf of the two councils shared with us a working assumption preferred option development strategy, including preferred growth level and distribution assumptions for dwellings, jobs and associated population growth.

Please note that use of the working assumption preferred option development strategy to inform this evidence base does not confer formal support by either council for that strategy. No decisions will be taken on development strategy assumptions until relevant member committees meet and approve documents for the Local Plan preferred options consultation. Such decisions will be informed by appraisal of reasonable alternatives. Setting out working assumptions in this and other notes does not prejudice those decisions.

1.2 Growth level

Following consideration of the November 2020 strategic spatial options evidence bases and Sustainability Appraisal, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning have determined that the medium level of homes associated with the central employment scenario represents the objectively assessed need for homes in Greater Cambridge. Having determined this, the previously assessed alternative growth options of minimum and maximum are no longer considered to represent reasonable alternatives.

Further to the above, the Greater Cambridge Local Plan Preferred Option growth level is the medium homes level, including a 1:1 commuting ratio for housing growth generated by additional jobs above those supported by the Standard Method, in line with the councils' aims of limiting longer distance commuting and thereby limiting carbon emissions (described as medium+). We, and other evidence base consultants, did not assess the medium+ level of growth for the Strategic Spatial options, but we do not consider that rerunning the evidence testing of the strategic spatial options against a new medium+ housing figure would result in materially different outcomes to our November 2020 conclusions.

Drawing on the above, we are testing the new spatial options of preferred option and Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt based on the medium+ growth level, and have not assessed the impacts of the previous alternative growth levels in relation to these new spatial options.

1.3 Spatial distribution

The Councils' working assumption preferred option is a blended strategy including a number of broad supply locations. To ensure that the preferred option is tested against reasonable alternatives, an assessment of the preferred option blended strategy has been completed, so that it can be compared against:

- the strategic spatial options tested last year
- other reasonable alternative blended strategies.

Some of the spatial options tested last year were blended strategies and others not. The Councils reviewed the strategic spatial options tested in November to see whether these included a range of reasonable alternative blended strategies, noting that they don't need to test every possible reasonable alternative. The conclusion to this assessment was that the only alternative blended strategy not yet tested was one including development at Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt. The Councils therefore identified a blended strategy development distribution for this spatial option, which is directly comparable to the preferred option and broadly comparable to the strategic spatial options from November 2020.

1.4 Spatial options tested

In this Infrastructure Delivery Plan Supplement, we test:

- Preferred option growth level: preferred options spatial strategy
- Preferred option growth level: Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt

1.5 Methodology

This Supplement Report assesses the above spatial options using the same methodology as completed for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options Assessment: Infrastructure Delivery Plan. See that report for further detail.

2 Spatial options

In this section we review the high-level infrastructure requirements generated by the two spatial scenarios at the medium+ level of growth, that inclusive of a 10% buffer increases the medium housing growth option by 2,640 taking the homes to be provided between 2020-41 to 48,240 and the balance to find to 12,440.

2.1 Preferred option growth level: preferred option spatial strategy

The Preferred Option is relatively close in distribution to Strategic Spatial Option 2: Edge of Cambridge: Non-Green Belt. To meet the medium+ growth figure the Preferred Option focuses new homes/jobs as follows:

Cambridge urban area

- North East Cambridge:
  - delivery by 2041 assumption: 3,900 homes/1,300 jobs;
  - full build out assumption: 8,350 homes/15,000 jobs
- North West Cambridge (densification of existing planned built up area)
  - delivery by 2041 assumption: 1,000 additional homes to those already committed
  - full build out assumption: 1,500 additional homes to those already committed
- Small sites within Cambridge urban area - limited amount of development relating to actual capacity: 200 homes

Edge of Cambridge non-Green Belt

- Cambridge Airport (initial phase post 2030, outside Green Belt):
  - delivery by 2041 assumption: 2,900 homes/100 net jobs
  - full build out assumption: 7,000 homes/9,000 net jobs

Edge of Cambridge Green Belt

- Cambridge Biomedical Campus:
  - delivery by 2041 assumption: none
  - full build out assumption: 8,300 net jobs

Western Cluster (focus on transport node)

- Expanded Cambourne:
  - delivery by 2041 assumption: 2,900 homes/300 jobs
  - Full build out assumption (as a proxy for a strategic scale development for the purposes of testing at this point): 10,000 homes/10,000 jobs

Southern Cluster (integrating jobs and homes)

- limited development distributed across Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centres, and Group Villages with very good Public Transport Access: approx. 600 homes

Dispersal to villages

- limited development distributed across Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centres, and Group Villages with very good Public Transport Access: approx. 900 homes

Rural area

Limited employment at Babraham and on the A14 corridor

- delivery by 2041 assumption: none assumed
- Full build out assumption: 1,400 jobs

In the plan period, the additional sites in the Preferred Option could in total contribute 12,900 homes and 2,300 net jobs. When fully built out, the Preferred Option, including the proxy for strategic scale development at Cambourne for testing referred to above, could contribute 28,550 homes and 43,700 jobs.'

Transport infrastructure

This option will require ‘corridor’ improvements in walking, cycling and public transport prioritisation to achieve an uplift in population in the urban area. There is limited opportunity to improve highway infrastructure within the existing urban area. Junction and corridor improvements have potential to support housing growth; however, CCC are increasing the emphasis on sustainable transport infrastructure through implementation of a ‘trip budget’ on the number of new trips generated at NEC AAP. It is likely that significant investment in sustainable transport infrastructure (which supports all modes of travel) will be required if the same approach is used for Cambridge Airport.

A review of parking infrastructure and a policy stance towards low parking ratios / car-free development in sustainable locations would be required. Lower levels of car ownership in new development would reduce pressure on transport infrastructure within the urban area. This would need to be supported by increased walking, cycling and public transport provision. Densification of the urban area would encourage trips by walking / cycling due to the proximity to existing services and facilities. Therefore, footways and cycleway infrastructure will be needed to provide a high-quality walking and cycling environment. Infrastructure should be provided which increases permeability for walking and cycling in the urban area.

Opportunities to improve walking and cycling infrastructure, such as widening of footways, implementing cycleways, bicycle traffic signals, bridges etc. should be explored. While reducing travel demand and encouraging sustainable travel must be prioritised, there will also be a need to improve highways infrastructure to enhance road safety and reduce congestion on the network. This could be through pinch point improvements. However, this must not incentivise car travel over sustainable modes.

This approach would be reliant on enhancing public transport corridors (bus lanes) within the city as well as facilitating easy access to Cambridge North station for NEC. The two existing stations (Cambridge and Cambridge North) and the one planned at Cambridge South should accommodate demand from housing growth. Infrastructure to improve access to these facilities should be explored. The same is true of East West Rail; if this scheme were to be delivered through funding secured from central Government, it will be important to factor in the last mile (and last five mile) connecting infrastructure that will be needed to make the new and improved stations accessible to growth in those locations.

For the growth allocated outside of the Cambridge urban area, infrastructure improvements are required to achieve sustainable links to jobs and the City. While there will be a heavy reliance on public transport Infrastructure for these areas, for example the C2C project for growth at Cambourne, highways infrastructure demands must not be neglected. Journey times to work and leisure for public transport should be more attractive than those made by car; however, for that to be the case, there will still need to be investment on the highway infrastructure to overcome potential pinch points along public transport corridors.

Social and community infrastructure

Social and community infrastructure assessed here and presented in Appendix A is for: forms of entry at primary and secondary schooling levels; number of FTE GPs and floorspace accommodation requirements; and floorspace accommodation requirements for community halls and libraries. These requirements are driven by housing and associated population growth, so employment led-growth such as that at Cambridge Biomedical Campus, will not normally feature here.

It is expected that North East Cambridge and the Airport as large new settlements would provide adequate on-site social and community infrastructure in line with standards. Given that these large sites will be developed up to and beyond 2041, provision of adequate facilities in a timely manner and in line with the housing growth will need to be carefully managed through appropriate trigger points in the timing of housing growth.

In this option, densification is expected in North West Cambridge (around 1,000 dwellings) and to a lesser extent throughout the remaining Cambridge Urban Area (about 200 dwellings). Collectively it is likely that new social and community infrastructure provision would be required in the North West of Cambridge urban area, but as an already built-up urban area this may be more efficiently undertaken through expansion of existing infrastructure. This will require a nuanced view on the spatial/catchment requirements of the specific infrastructure.

Growth spread among villages, and the area known as the Southern cluster, is likely to be too small to warrant new facilities, so the capacity of existing provision will need to be considered and an appropriate contribution made in the locality on a case by case basis as more information is at hand. The issue that this raises that has scale threshold implications, is that relatively modest incremental growth spread thinly does not generate the critical mass to justify social and community infrastructure.

An indication of the facilities required resulting from the development and population associated with the Preferred Option is set out in Appendix A.

Green infrastructure, sports and leisure

Growth at NEC and the Airport will result in a requirement for a significant amount of outdoor sport and/or open space in order to meet current standards. For example, the Regulation 18 consultation draft of the NEC AAP sets out that the whole area encompasses 182 ha. The requirement for outdoor sport and open space to meet the preferred option would be around a third of this in total, so it is unlikely this can all be accommodated on site. In order to deliver this an innovative/intensive approach to provision will be needed, and this may be complemented by off-site provision.

In terms of other green infrastructure the amount of development proposed east and northeast of Cambridge City would result in increased recreational pressure on surrounding green infrastructure assets such as Milton Park, Chesterton Fen, Coldhams Common, Wilbraham Fens and the River Cam corridor However, green infrastructure opportunities which could be supported as a result of this scenario include increasing connectivity to the River Cam Corridor, Chesterton Fen and Milton Park, enhancement of the Cherry Hinton Brook corridor and enhancement / expansion of local nature reserves at Stourbridge Common, Coldhams Common, Norman Cement pits/Hystor open space, Cherry Hinton East Pit, Nine Wells LNR Extension, Coe Fen/Sheep's Green and Byron's Pool.

At northwest Cambridge, it could be appropriate to create a green infrastructure buffer along the western side of the development area and provide links westwards towards Coton Country Park.

All development in the Cambridge area could also contribute towards a new area of strategic open space located broadly to the north of the city, as identified in the Green Infrastructure Opportunities Mapping Part 2 Report.

Growth at Cambourne is likely to result in increased recreational pressure at the Cambourne Nature Reserve, Overhall Grove SSSI, Hardwick Wood, Fen Drayton, Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation. However, there may be opportunities to expand these areas and to contribute to some of the nature recovery network schemes, particularly woodland expansion such as the Cambridgeshire Hundreds.

For sports provision, 4.4 sports halls would be needed to serve the increased population. These would best be provided within the new development areas, it may be appropriate to expand some facilities as well as provide wholly new built ones.

A requirement for a total of 1.2 swimming pools is generated by the new population proposed. The need for swimming pools is roughly split between Cambourne and between the developments around Cambridge City. There is understood to be unmet demand in Cambridge and Cambourne so provision of more than one pool facility may be needed given the requirement to meet current and future demand.

Utilities

The growth areas within and on the edge of Cambridge are adjacent to existing residential areas and/or industrial estates, and therefore are likely to be already well served by the utility networks, and relatively easy to connect into. Utility infrastructure constraints may exist across

some of these areas, which may require diverting or protecting networks. The suitability of the existing networks for the growth areas to connect into will only become apparent through further more detailed investigations.

Beyond the urban area at Cambourne, the southern cluster and in the villages longer offsite connections may be required. Location of the nearest existing utility infrastructure should be considered at an early stage, as this can impact on both project cost and programme, and can make a location unviable. There may also be limitations on the capacity of the network connection available and a need for upgrade to support larger scale growth, and this is likely to be an issue with the scale of growth proposed for Cambourne.

In terms of the water cycle this has been assessed using the method used in the November 2020 spatial options report[1], and the Preferred Option ranked third best out of ten. It scores relatively highly in the appraisal because it includes the larger developments of North East Cambridge, Cambridge Airport and Cambourne, which would have good opportunities for blue-green infrastructure, flood risk reduction and high-quality resilient water recycling systems.

Development in villages could raise some constraints due to flood risk, wastewater capacity and potentially fewer opportunities for betterment due to the smaller size of sites, but this would be dependent upon the specific site allocations and requirements of policy in the Local Plan.

Specific water cycle constraints which require management and/or further investment associated with the preferred spatial option are connected to growth at Cambourne where local wastewater treatment capacity constraints are not easily overcome, although this is possible via transfers to Papworth Everard WRW. There are however opportunities to supply Cambourne with fresh water from outside the area easing likely short term local supply shortages.

Power is also a general constraint across the electricity network with all five 132kV grid substations having capacity issues and network reinforcement is needed to support the existing planned development, in respect of which UKPN are known to be addressing. While there may be some reserve capacity in the network after these reinforcements, all additional growth area development for residential and for employment uses will require further reinforcement to the power network. As referred to in the previous report the lack of power capacity issue is across the board, with no geographical focus. However, it is not considered an absolute constraint, as all five substations can be reinforced, and thus it is a matter of timing and financing rather than seeking a technical/physical constraint solution.

Rural broadband width for data and mobile phone signals are critical issues to provide to a satisfactory quality, and an additional cost for less well connected rural areas.

2.2 Preferred option growth level: Blended Strategy incl Edge of Cambridge Green Belt

This option is identical to the Preferred Option, except for the inclusion of development at Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt in place of development around Cambourne (the Western Cluster).

[1] Appendix 4 of the Strategic Spatial Options Assessment for integrated water management (2020)

Edge of Cambridge Green Belt

- unspecified site(s) 2,000 homes and 300 jobs

In the plan period, the additional sites in the Blended Option could in total contribute 12,900 homes and 2,300 net jobs. When fully built out the Preferred Option, including the proxy for strategic scale development at Cambourne for testing referred to above, could contribute 22,050 homes and 34,000 jobs.'.

Transport infrastructure

The priority arising from this Blended Strategy option will be significant investment in active travel modes and public transport infrastructure to accommodate the extra growth within the Cambridge Urban area.

The Transport infrastructure requirements for the preferred approach would also apply to this blended strategy option. The additional 2,000 homes on the edge of Cambridge would require support from either new or improved transport infrastructure connecting this growth to jobs and local amenities. This could be in the form of additional (or extension to) corridor improvements that increase reliability and attractiveness of walking, cycling and bus journeys.

In general, locating homes close to jobs gives the best chance to improve walking and cycling potential. The Blended Strategy aims to achieve this, but transport infrastructure improvements will still be required to reduce congestion and facilitate modal shift from the car to alternative sustainable modes of travel.

Social and community infrastructure

The main priority with the blended option, as with the Preferred option, will be to deliver social and community infrastructure at a scale to accommodate the needs of the new communities at North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport.

Substantial housing growth is also anticipated by this option on one or more non-site specific Green Belt location/s on the edge of Cambridge. As with village and Southern cluster growth referenced under the Preferred option, it may be the case that growth at these unspecified sites is to be too small to warrant new facilities, so the capacity of existing provision will need to be considered and appropriate contribution made in the locality on a case by case basis as more information is at hand. The issue that this raises is the scale threshold implications, a relatively modest incremental growth spread thinly does not generate the critical mass to justify social and community infrastructure.

Green infrastructure, sports and leisure

For open space, as for the preferred option, the requirement arising from this Blended Strategy option will be significant, requiring innovative, land efficient and off-site solutions.

For other green infrastructure, as per the Preferred Option, development around the edge of Cambridge (northwest, northeast, east and in an unspecified location in the Green Belt) has the

potential to impact upon the surrounding green infrastructure – the same areas are likely to be affected by both the Preferred Option and this Blended Strategy option. Given the greater focus of development on Cambridge within this option, the impacts would be worse than under the Preferred Option. These impacts are not likely to be substantially greater given the amount of development proposed around Cambridge is only 2,000 dwellings more; although this depends on some extent to the location of the growth within the Green Belt, which is not known at present. Green infrastructure improvement opportunities are likely to be similar to those set out for the Preferred Option.

The green infrastructure implications for Cambourne as set out above would not occur under this Blended Strategy option, but neither would the green infrastructure opportunities.

For sports the amount of development proposed would not quite justify a swimming pool (0.8 required), but it is understood that there is unmet demand in Cambridge City so in combination the current and future demand is likely to justify the provision of a pool, a suitable location for which would be either to the east or centrally within Cambridge, given the high level of accessibility to the centre which is envisaged from the development sites.

A need for the equivalent of 3.2 sports halls would be generated by the amount of development envisaged. These would best be provided within the new development areas, it may be appropriate to expand some facilities as well as provide wholly new built ones.

Utilities

In the Green Belt areas there is a risk that reinforcement to the local network, and possibly the wider network, may be required to accommodate new load requirements from proposed developments. Reinforcement works can be very expensive and have long lead in times and should be highlighted at the early stages of any development as a risk to programme and project budget

Water cycle - the comments for the assessment of the Preferred Option apply to this hybrid option in almost all respects, and it scored very similarly to the PO in the assessment, coming forth out of ten overall. The relatively high score reflects the inclusion of the larger developments of North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport, which provide good opportunities for blue-green infrastructure, flood risk reduction and high-quality resilient water recycling systems.

Development in villages could have some constraints due to flood risk, wastewater capacity and potentially fewer opportunities for betterment due to the smaller size of sites, but this would be dependent upon the specific site allocations and requirements of policy in the Local Plan. There may be some constraints for development in the Green Belt because existing fluvial and surface water flood risk may make individual sites difficult to deliver, but this depends upon location.

The issues around power capacity explained above in respect of the Preferred Option apply equally to the hybrid option, and thus we do not repeat those comments again here.

3 Conclusions

This report supports the Preferred Option stage of the Local Plan production, a stage where proposals for the growth areas are not fleshed out, and this assessment of the infrastructure requirements of the spatial options is therefore necessarily high level and focusing on the key infrastructure issues. It is also relevant to note that a significant amount of growth in the growth areas is already allocated in development plan documents, and this report therefore treats that allocated growth as part of the existing baseline and only considers the likely infrastructure requirements from the additional growth in the two potential spatial growth options.

Transport infrastructure - In general locating homes close to jobs give the best chance to improve walking, cycling and public transport potential, and because the Growth Areas identified in both the Preferred Option and Hybrid Option do this in terms of the bulk of the additional growth being in the urban and on the edge of the urban area, both are considered better options than those spatial options that have a much more dispersed approach where it will be necessary to provide viable linkages to jobs in and around Cambridge, which may require completely new transport infrastructure.

Social and community infrastructure - are directly related to population growth and cover a broad range of infrastructure types, with diverse delivery agencies and standards for assessing need. We have applied relevant standards to both scenarios to determine the requirements for the key infrastructure requirements for primary and secondary education, primary healthcare, community facilities and libraries. These requirements are set out in the Appendix to this report. Because of the existing capacity issues particularly in the urban area new provision will generally be required within the growth areas and in an early phase of development to be available to serve the new population. The provision of additional infrastructure in the more rural elements of the scenarios (including in the Green Belt) will have critical mass issues and may well lead to longer travel distances to access facilities.

Green infrastructure - has also been assessed using a standards-based approach, and these requirements are set out in the Appendix to this report. Overall, the existing provision of sports facilities in the Greater Cambridge area is good, but there are capacity constraints for the current population, and therefore it is critical that the growth areas provide new facilities, to meet the demand of an increased population. Greater Cambridge is rich in biodiversity assets, and generally the more spatially dispersed and non-urban growth areas (including Green Belt) have a higher potential to affect these assets. It is important that development is designed to consider the current habitat networks which are found within a site and wherever possible avoiding or minimising loss of existing habitat and habitat fragmentation impacts taking account of the need to secure biodiversity net gain. Due to the nature of green infrastructure, the effect and need for offsetting mitigation will be influenced by the location of the growth, and the green infrastructure assets in proximity to that growth.

Utility infrastructure - this high-level review has considered the possible risk of existing utility constraints, the ease of connections to existing utility networks for new supplies and the capacity / reinforcement risks on existing utility networks. In all scenarios, but particularly those with an urban focus there may be existing utility infrastructure that crosses the growth areas, which would require diverting or protecting to enable any anticipated growth without constraint, and such reinforcement works can be very expensive and have long lead-in times and will need to be considered in detail at the next Plan stage. The key utility items are water resources and power. Water resources constraints are more dependent on the quantum rather than the location of the development. That said the more rural elements of the Preferred Option and the Hybrid carry more risk in terms of connecting into existing utility networks compared to the urban and edge of urban elements, but again because the rural elements are a relatively minor part of the overall growth area mix, for these strategic options utility connections are much less of a risk compared to the options with a greater emphasis on non-urban growth. In time, the different growth scenarios will all exceed current planned water demand, and while in the longer term i.e. by 2035, it is anticipated that supply will be bolstered by the Lincolnshire water supply reservoir in the medium term there is scope to mitigate this through investment in AMP8/9 (2025-35). Turning to power, both spatial options (and indeed all the other options) will lead to considerable additional demand for electricity given existing constraints albeit infrastructure reinforcements are planned to deliver existing committed growth. As with water there are technical solutions, with the risks around timing and financing of solutions rather than power supply acting as an absolute constraint.

Appendix A Requirements to 2041 i) Social and community and ii) Green infrastructure, sports and leisure

SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

Primary schools - number of Forms of Entry

2020-2041	Preferred Option Medium+	Blended Strategy Medium+
Cambridge urban area	2.3	2.3
North East Cambridge	7.4	7.4
Cambridge Airport (safeguarded land)	5.5	5.5
Green Belt Fringe		3.8
New settlements on public transport corridors	3.8	
New settlements on road network		
Villages Total	1.7	
Rural centres		
Minor rural centres		
Group	1.1	
Infill		
Total	**21.9**	**19.0**

Secondary schools (excluding Sixth Form) – number of Forms of Entry

2020-2041	Preferred Option Medium+	Blended Strategy Medium+
Cambridge urban area	1.7	1.7
North East Cambridge	5.4	5.4
Cambridge Airport (safeguarded land)	4.0	4.0
Green Belt Fringe		2.8
New settlements on public transport corridors	2.8	
New settlements on road network		
Villages Total	1.3	
Rural centres		
Minor rural centres		
Group	1.1	
Infill		
Total	**16.3**	**13.9**

Primary healthcare – number of GPs required based on ratio of 1 FTE GP per 1,800 new residents

2020-2041	Preferred Option Medium+	Blended Strategy Medium+
Cambridge urban area	1.5	1.5
North East Cambridge	5.0	5.0
Cambridge Airport (safeguarded land)	3.7	3.7
Green Belt Fringe		2.6
New settlements on public transport corridors	2.6	
New settlements on road network		
Villages Total	1.2	
Rural centres		
Minor rural centres		
Group	0.8	
Infill		
Total	**14.7**	**12.8**

Primary healthcare – floorspace requirement (sqm)

2020-2041	Preferred Option Medium+	Blended Strategy Medium+
Cambridge urban area	322	322
North East Cambridge	1,047	1,047
Cambridge Airport (safeguarded land)	778	778
Green Belt Fringe		537
New settlements on public transport corridors	537	
New settlements on road network		
Villages Total	242	
Rural centres		
Minor rural centres		
Group	161	
Infill		
Total	**3,086**	**2,683**

Community facilities - floorspace requirement (sqm) based on population estimates

2020-2041	Preferred Option Medium+	Blended Strategy Medium+
Cambridge urban area	306	306
North East Cambridge	996	996
Cambridge Airport (safeguarded land)	740	740
Green Belt Fringe		511
New settlements on public transport corridors	511	
New settlements on road network		
Villages Total	230	
Rural centres		
Minor rural centres		
Group	153	
Infill		
Total	**2,936**	**2,553**

Libraries - floorspace requirement (sqm) based on population estimates

2020-2041	Preferred Option Medium+	Blended Strategy Medium+
Cambridge urban area	83	83
North East Cambridge	269	269
Cambridge Airport (safeguarded land)	200	200
Green Belt Fringe		138
New settlements on public transport corridors	138	
New settlements on road network		
Villages Total	62	
Rural centres		
Minor rural centres		
Group	41	
Infill		
Total	**794**	**690**

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE, SPORT AND LEISURE

Outside space requirements (ha)

2020-2041	Preferred Option Medium+	Blended Strategy Medium+
Cambridge urban area	9.9	9.9
North East Cambridge	32.3	32.3
Cambridge Airport (safeguarded land)	24.0	24.0
Green Belt Fringe		16.6
New settlements on public transport corridors	12.9	
New settlements on road network		
Villages Total	5.8	5.8
Rural centres		
Minor rural centres		
Group	3.9	3.9
Infill		
Total	**88.9**	**92.5**

Sports halls (number)

2020-2041	Preferred Option Medium+	Blended Strategy Medium+
Cambridge urban area	0.2	0.2
North East Cambridge	0.6	0.6
Cambridge Airport (safeguarded land)	0.5	0.5
Green Belt Fringe		0.3
New settlements on public transport corridors	0.3	
New settlements on road network		
Villages Total	0.1	0.1
Rural centres		
Minor rural centres		
Group	0.1	0.1
Infill		
Total	**1.8**	**1.8**

Swimming pools (number)

2020-2041	Preferred Option Medium+	Blended Strategy Medium+
Cambridge urban area	0.0	0.0
North East Cambridge	0.2	0.2
Cambridge Airport (safeguarded land)	0.1	0.1
Green Belt Fringe		0.1
New settlements on public transport corridors	0.1	
New settlements on road network		
Villages Total	0.0	0.0
Rural centres		
Minor rural centres		
Group	0.0	0.0
Infill		
Total	**0.5**	**0.5**