

# Site Allocations Topic Paper



## Greater Cambridge Local Plan

Topic Paper published as part of the Draft Local Plan -  
Regulation 18 consultation (December 2025 - January 2026)

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	4
Topic papers overview.....	4
Sites topic paper overview .....	5
Greater Cambridge Local Plan process to date in relation to site allocations .....	5
Evidence informing the site allocations .....	6
2. Cambridge Urban Area.....	10
Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations.....	10
Response to issues raised in representations.....	10
Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge .....	12
Policy S/LAC: Other site allocations in Cambridge.....	18
Individual site allocations in the Cambridge Urban Area .....	24
Sites in the First Proposals that are not included in the Draft Local Plan .....	53
Housing.....	53
Mixed Use .....	55
Adopted allocations not proposed to be carried forward in the draft Local Plan	55
Housing.....	55
Employment.....	56
Mixed Use .....	56
Policy Areas .....	57
Policy S/PA/CC: Cambridge City Centre .....	57
Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major Change.....	61
Policy S/PRIA: Public Realm Improvement Areas (PRIA) in Cambridge.....	71
3. Edge of Cambridge.....	83
Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations.....	83
Response to issues raised in representations.....	84
Policy S/CE: Cambridge East .....	84
Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke’s Hospital).....	100
Policy S/NWC: Eddington, Cambridge .....	113
Policy S/WC: West Cambridge.....	118
Policy S/HHR: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road.....	122
Policy S/EOC: Other site allocations on the edge of Cambridge.....	126

4. New Settlements .....	135
Approach to New Settlements in First Proposals .....	135
Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations.....	135
Response to issues raised in representations.....	135
5. Existing New Settlements .....	160
6. The Rural Southern Cluster .....	176
Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations.....	176
Response to issues raised in representations.....	177
Policy S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton.....	177
Policy S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus .....	180
Policy S/RSC: Other site allocations in the Rural Southern Cluster .....	185
Individual Site Allocations.....	191
S/RSC/FSS: Former Spicers Site, Sawston Business Park, Sawston .....	195
Sites in the First Proposals that are not included in the Draft Local Plan .....	196
Allocations not proposed to be carried forward in the draft Local Plan.....	198
Policy S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster .....	199
Policy S/AMC/WHD: Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge	200
S/AMC/GP: Granta Park .....	202
Policy S/PA/LN: South of A1307, Linton .....	203
7. Rest of rural area .....	205
Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations.....	205
Response to issues raised in representations.....	206
Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to.....	206
Policy context update .....	206
Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations.....	206
New or Updated Evidence base.....	206
Further information supporting draft policy approach .....	208
Additional alternative approaches considered.....	209
Response to issues raised in representations.....	209
Policy S/RRA: Site allocations in rest of the rural area.....	209
Policy S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area .....	235
Policy areas in the First Proposals that are not included in the Draft Local Plan	
.....	240



# 1. Introduction

## Topic papers overview

- 1.1 This is one of nine topic papers produced to inform the Draft Plan consultation on the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The topic papers are:
- Strategy
  - Sites
  - Climate Change
  - Green Infrastructure
  - Wellbeing and Social
  - Great Places
  - Jobs
  - Homes
  - Infrastructure
- 1.2 All of the papers can be found on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website. The topic papers set out how each policy under the relevant Local Plan 'Theme' has been developed. As such, the topic papers support and complement the Draft Plan consultation document as they provide a detailed explanation of the basis for each draft policy.
- 1.3 The Topic Papers build on those published as part of the First Proposals Consultation. They provide background on the early development of the policies. These are still available to view in our document library.
- 1.4 The policies are presented in a consistent format in each paper with sufficient information to provide a comprehensive appreciation of the background to and development of the Policy.
- 1.5 The content and structure for each policy option is:
- The issue the plan is seeking to respond to
  - How was the issue covered in the First Proposals consultation?
  - Policy Context update
  - Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations
  - New or updated evidence (where relevant)
  - Additional alternative approaches considered
  - Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations
  - Further work and next steps
- 1.6 The local plan is supported by a wide range of evidence which can be found in our document library. Key supporting documents to the plan include:

- Statement of Consultation
- Sustainability Appraisal
- Habitats Regulations Assessment
- Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA)

## **Sites topic paper overview**

1.7 This Topic Paper sets out the Councils' approach to its preferred site allocations in the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan. Set out based on broad locations, it identifies the evidence and analysis undertaken to demonstrate how the site allocations meet national planning policy requirements for Plan making and how they will cumulatively, deliver the Local Plan Strategy.

1.8 The Topic Paper is structured based on the following broad locations for development included within the plan:

- Cambridge Urban Area
- Edge of Cambridge
- New Settlements
- The Rural Southern Cluster
- The Rest of the Rural Area

1.9 The following sub-sections immediately below provide information relevant to sites within all of the above broad locations:

- Greater Cambridge Local Plan process to date in relation to site allocations
- Evidence informing the site allocations
- Further work and next steps

## **Greater Cambridge Local Plan process to date in relation to site allocations**

1.10 Formal work on the Greater Cambridge Local Plan began in 2019, with the following key stages in relation to sites:

- 2019: Call for Sites
- January-February 2020: Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Conservation consultation including the submission of additional sites from site promoters
- November-December 2021: Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals Consultation, including the publication of the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and submission of

additional sites and representations on existing sites from site promoters

- February 2025: Site Submission Update, providing the opportunity for site promoters to provide additional sites or information

## Evidence informing the site allocations

1.11 A wide range of evidence has informed the identification of sites for allocations, and then the policy requirements included in each allocation. Evidence associated with specific sites is explained in the relevant allocation section. Evidence that is relevant to all the sites is explained directly below.

## Evidence informing the identification of sites to allocate

1.12 A full explanation of how sites were identified for allocation is set out in the Development Strategy topic paper. Key detailed evidence informing selection of specific sites is available as follows:

- **Greater Cambridge Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment 2025 (HELAA 2025):** assesses the suitability, availability and achievability of sites submitted to the Local Plan process (noting that sites submitted in 2025 were only assessed where they were located in reasonable alternative broad locations of supply, as defined in Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 4: Review of sites to inform identification of allocations at draft plan stage). The HELAA includes consideration of representations received on specific sites through the First Proposals consultation and information provided by landowners and site promoters through the Call for Sites and Submission Update exercises, and where necessary revised assessments have been completed such that for some sites the scoring of particular assessments or the overall assessments have changed from those included in the previously published HELAA 2021.
- **Greater Cambridge Integrated Water Management Study - Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA):** The Level 1 SFRA maps the level of flood risk for a range of potential sources, identifying the extent and severity of flood risk throughout the study area. The Level 1 SFRA also identifies the potential effects of climate change and development on future flood risk. The mapping and data presented within the Level 1 SFRA helped to inform the application of the sequential test in the plan-making process.
- **Greater Cambridge Flood Risk Sequential Test:** The report demonstrates how the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan has been informed by a sequential, risk-based approach to flooding in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Policy

Guidance (PPG). It did not include sites that have planning permission as these sites would have considered flood risk and mitigation measures as part of that more detailed planning application process.

- Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 3: Review of Adopted Allocations in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and Area Action Plans: Identifies whether each adopted allocation remains available and achievable such that it could be considered for carrying forwards into the new Local Plan, re-allocated for an alternative use in the new Local Plan, or if it should be de-allocated where it no longer remains available and achievable. The appendix informs this conclusion based upon the planning status of sites adopted in the current Local Plans, and any information on their anticipated delivery.
- Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 4: Review of sites to inform identification of new allocations at draft plan stage: confirms the Councils' position regarding whether sites within reasonable alternative broad locations are preferred for allocation, or not preferred, drawing together development strategy considerations set out in this topic paper, alongside the evidence of suitability, availability and achievability. All sites within reasonable alternative broad locations have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal, which has been completed alongside preparation of the draft plan.

## **Evidence informing site capacities and delivery trajectories**

### **Site capacity**

1.13 The number of homes or amount of floorspace set out for each allocation is an indicative capacity for that use that has been informed by consideration of:

- the information provided by the landowner or site promoter through their site submission or representations to the First Proposals consultation,
- the capacity approach for housing sites set out in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (2025)
- the site typology and capacity approach for employment sites drawing on Employment and Housing Evidence Update 2024-2045, Greater Cambridge Industrial and Warehousing Study 2025, Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study: Life science and ICT locational, land and accommodation needs (2024)
- site specific constraints and mitigation measures, including drawing on expertise from officers across the councils including urban design, landscape, heritage and highways officers in specific instances.
- Greater Cambridge Integrated Water Management Study – Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment assesses site-specific flood risks and sets out a range of flood risk assessment, site design, and flood

management recommendations for the sites that were “screened in” for further assessment as part of the Sequential Test process.

- Specific considerations that have informed the capacity of each site are included in the draft policy and reasons section of the specific allocation in the Individual Site Allocations section.

## Housing Trajectory and Housing Delivery Study

- 1.14 **Development Strategy Topic paper Appendix 9: Housing Trajectory for the Local Plan** provides information supporting housing trajectory set out in the draft plan to meet our 2025 housing need figure. This includes an assessment of anticipated delivery for each new allocation.
- 1.15 The draft plan housing trajectory has been assessed in our **Housing Delivery Study 2025**. This independently produced evidence document confirms that the strategy and housing trajectory set out in the draft plan to meet our 2025 housing need figure can be delivered in housing delivery terms, including providing a five year housing land supply at plan adoption and throughout the plan period assuming a 5% buffer, and would pass the Housing Delivery Test.

## Evidence informing design requirements included within the allocation policies

- 1.16 **HELAA**: The HELAA 2025 identifies environmental constraints that have provided the starting point for design requirements included in each allocation.

## Heritage Impact Assessments

- 1.17 Chris Blandford Associates (CBA) were commissioned to prepare Heritage Impact Assessments for selected allocations. An individual Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared for each proposed allocation where the site is not subject to an adopted allocation (and the proposed mix and quantum of development remains unchanged), and/or an existing, recent, planning permission and construction had not started on site. The assessments:
- identify and discuss designated and non-designated heritage assets within the site and surrounding area,
  - review the risks posed to the heritage assets by the proposed development,
  - make recommendations for necessary design-based mitigation measures, and

- highlight the level of risk in relation to impacts on the key characteristics of Cambridge and other heritage assets if the site is allocated for development.

1.18 Detailed information on the HIA assessment of each site is included in the new or updated evidence section of the specific allocation in the Individual Site Allocations section.

### Evidence produced by site promoters

1.19 For some strategic sites in this Topic paper evidence produced by the promoter is referenced. This evidence has not been endorsed by the Councils or other public body unless stated otherwise. As such they form further background information that provides context to the draft policy.

### Further work and next steps

1.20 For all allocations, Policy Areas and policies related to site allocations, we will review the comments received on the draft Local Plan prior to preparing the proposed submission version, alongside any further evidence or changes to national or local policy.

1.21 Where there are specific actions required to be completed ahead of the proposed submission stage, these are set out in the relevant allocation section.

## **2. Cambridge Urban Area**

2.1 This chapter provides a background summary of the evidence and representations received from earlier stages of consultation on the sites within the existing Cambridge Urban Area.

### **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

2.2 Issues raised in the representations include:

- General support for developing in the Cambridge urban area, with particular support from Parish Councils, Huntingdonshire District Council and the University of Cambridge for: protection of the historic core, appropriate design for new developments, regeneration of areas that are not fulfilling their potential, re-use of brownfield sites (particularly existing buildings) and enabling a decrease in climate impacts.
- Concerns from Teversham PC about the benefits of redeveloping particular sites if these facilities are lost or relocated to rural areas, and about the loss of green spaces for wildlife and quality of life.
- Concerns from Cambridge Past, Present & Future and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties about the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the scale of the proposed growth.
- Comments from Parish Councils, Cambridgeshire County Council and University of Cambridge about private car use, and use of alternative forms of transport.
- Site promoters' comments highlight the need for a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge and the problems of focussing on large sites. Comments that no reference has been made to the pandemic and its implications for future development.
- Support for protection of historic core, however, Historic England and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlight need to consider wider setting and views, and need for more detailed considerations and evidence.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

2.1 Responses issues raised in representations include:

- General support for appropriate development in the Cambridge urban area is noted. Policies in the wider draft local plan seek to ensure that heritage is appropriately protected and development is a high quality design.

- Concerns from Teversham PC about the benefits of redeveloping particular sites if these facilities are lost or relocated to rural areas, and about the loss of green spaces for wildlife and quality of life. The draft local plan requires protection of existing open spaces, and creation of new spaces.
- Concerns from Cambridge Past, Present & Future and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties about the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the scale of the proposed growth. Proposed allocations have been carefully considered through the site testing process. They respond to national planning policies to make best use of brownfield land including through development densities, whilst protecting character and heritage.
- Comments from Parish Councils, Cambridgeshire County Council and University of Cambridge about private car use, and use of alternative forms of transport. Transport modelling has been used to inform the local plan. Measures will be needed to address traffic in Cambridge, along with improvements to support public transport and active travel. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, as the local transport authority, are developing a transport plan in parallel with the local plan.
- Site promoters' comments highlight the need for a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge and the problems of focussing on large sites. A range of different strategy choices were considered to inform the strategy of the draft local plan. The approach responds to climate change and sustainability evidence, providing the best opportunity for growth to be supported by infrastructure.
- Comments were made that no reference has been made to the pandemic and its implications for future development. There are many changes which have followed the pandemic which have influenced the draft local plan. The importance of green infrastructure and open space has been recognised, and the need for a variety of local community spaces and cultural provision. Health and wellbeing is also an integral theme of the plan
- Historic England highlight need to consider wider setting and views, and need for more detailed considerations and evidence. The draft local plan has been informed by a suite of evidence. Including Heritage Impact Assessments and a Tall Building Study.

## **Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

2.2 To provide guidance as to how this large, cross-boundary site will be developed over the next 20 years and beyond. The North East Cambridge area (NEC) contains an important employment cluster, alongside education facilities at Cambridge Regional College, and transport assets such as Cambridge North station and the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway. It has long been seen as a key opportunity site for regeneration and development. Funding to relocate the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP) provides a once-in-a-generation opportunity to comprehensively transform the area and create a new city district for Cambridge. Development will take place across multiple phases by multiple landowners and developers. The site allocation seeks to ensure that development is brought forward in both a comprehensive and coordinated way that addresses constraints, manages cumulative impacts, and optimises the development potential of the area.

### **How was the issue covered in the First Proposals Consultation?**

2.3 NEC was identified as a broad location for strategic scale growth in the First Proposals. This reflected the fact that the Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire Council had prepared a draft Area Action Plan to realise the growth opportunity provided by the potential relocation of the CWWTP that occupies a large portion of the area and currently restricts the introduction of odour sensitive uses, such as residential use. The Proposed Submission Draft of the AAP identified capacity to deliver 8,350 new homes and an additional 15,000 new jobs.

2.4 The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here:  
Insert Link

2.5 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: [Strategy Topic Paper](#)

### **Policy context update**

2.6 The policy in the Draft Local Plan has been informed by the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan. Following several stages of consultation a draft Proposed Submission Area Action Plan was agreed in January 2022. Publication of this would await the outcome of the Development Consent Order Application process for relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Works. the plan documents can be found in the [North East Cambridge Area Action](#)

[Plan Draft Proposed Submission Stage Document Library](#), including the [North East Cambridge AAP Statement of Consultation](#).

2.7 In August 2025, the Government announced that it will not be funding the relocation of the CWWTP through the Housing Infrastructure Fund, which means that there is uncertainty as to whether the effective delivery of the residential component of the Councils' vision for North East Cambridge will take place in the time period previously envisaged, including the assumed delivery of housing within the plan period. Building on the policies for this area already included in the adopted Local Plans, for this draft plan consultation the Councils are retaining the draft allocation for NEC incorporating the vision previously set out in the NEC Proposed Submission Area Action Plan, noting the significant benefits that a comprehensive mixed use development at this site would bring. Delivery of this vision would be subject to alternative funding being found to enable the relocation of the CWWTP.

2.8 Ahead of the Proposed Submission stage in 2026, the Councils will continue to engage with relevant partners to confirm a refined position for that later plan-making stage. This refined plan position will inform the spatial development framework to be taken forward in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

## **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

2.9 Issues raised in the representations include:

- Objections were received to the relocation of the CWWTP on the grounds they did not consider it necessary to build a new plant when the existing one was operating fine, with parts recently upgraded. Concerns were also raised with proposed site for the relocated facility within Green Belt at Honey Hill and the potential impacts this would have on the area and its surrounds.
- A number of representations supported the provision for growth in a part of the city they considered to be a highly sustainable location with good accessibility. These included Historic England, Gonville & Caius College, some parish councils and number of the landowners and developers.
- There was also support for the provision of retail and leisure facilities within a 15-minute radius to support the local community without having to travel elsewhere.
- Concerns were raised about the deliverability of 4,000 homes in the plan period, particularly affordable housing and infrastructure dependent on a successful Development Consent Order process for relocation of the CWWTP.

- There were also concern regarding the potential for impacts and the unprecedented higher density and heights proposed for the area which were not considered appropriate within a Cambridge context. Comments thought residential development should be planned at a lower density, with affordable homes to accommodate families. Other objections raised issues with the potential lack of on-site green open space provision, and concern this would place an over-reliance on existing provision such as Milton Country Park and Wicken Fen.

## New or Updated Evidence base

2.10 **Planning Permissions:** Several planning permission have been granted within the NEC area since consultation on the First Proposals. These include:

- **St Johns Innovation Park Phase 1** – The provision of 37,000sqm of new floorspace including two commercial/business buildings of 5 and 6 storeys respectively, a transport hub, gymnasium, surface parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure including demolition of the existing building (St Johns House) and associated structures.
- **Land north of Cambridge North Station** – which was granted on appeal for a hybrid planning application. The outline application for up to 425 residential units with flexible uses on the ground floor, and two commercial buildings for either office or research and development, again with flexible uses on the ground floor. The full application was for three commercial buildings for offices or research and development with flexible ground floor uses, car and cycle parking, a multi storey car and cycle park building.
- **Vitrum Building St Johns Innovation Park** – for replacement of the existing buildings with a Research and Development building (use Class E) providing an uplift in floorspace of 12,301sqm, including basement levels for car parking and building services, as well as associated landscaping, cycle parking.
- **Taylor Vinters Merlin Place** – for development of a new 13,096 sqm (GIA) research and development facility, including provision for office accommodation (4,648 sqm). Laboratory space (4,388 sqm), Cafe (161 sqm), car and cycle parking spaces.
- **440 Cambridge Science Park** – development of a Research and Development / Office building (use Class E) providing 13,128sqm (GIA) floorspace, with associated landscaping, car and cycle parking.

2.11 There are also well-advanced proposals for 210-240 Cambridge Science Park & the Trinity Hally Farm site, both promoting significant new commercial floorspace (a mix of Office and Research and Development).

- 2.12 The above planning permissions depart from the mix and quantum proposed for individual land parcels within the Proposed Submission Draft of the NEC AAP. In general, the schemes currently coming forward promote a greater quantum of commercial floorspace and often at the expense of residential use. Such departures have implications for the application of County's Trip Budget approach for managing transport impacts and for other infrastructure requirements, such as power supply, the number of school places, or the amount of community floorspace required to meet the needs of the residential use.
- 2.13 With respect to the NEC Trip Budget, the County's position is that a net cumulative increase of c.320,000sqm of Office or Research & Development floorspace across NEC could be supported with the known package of mitigation measures, but provision more than this is unlikely to be capable of support from a highways perspective as things currently stand. Further work on the transport strategy for NEC is ongoing and likely to be informed by the work on the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy.
- 2.14 With respect to infrastructure requirements, the Councils commissioned an update to the 2021 NEC Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The updated IDP considered three strategic alternative development scenarios for NEC and the implications of each for the infrastructure required:
- **Scenario 1: NEC AAP with consented trajectory** – takes account of the planning permissions granted and the resulting increase in the net additional commercial floorspace from 224,400 sqm under the 2021 AAP to 385,897 sqm, resulting in an uplift of c.18,915 additional jobs. The overall number of new homes to be provided at NEC reduces under this scenario from 8,350 units to 7,835 units.
  - **Scenario 2: NEC AAP with developer aspirations trajectory** – applies the Scenario 1 trend to the remainder of NEC sites, assuming these will also promote intensification of commercial floorspace and reduce the overall number of homes. This scenario would deliver a net uplift in commercial floorspace of c.1.2m sqm, with c.787,746 sqm coming forward within the NEC plan period to 2041. This level of commercial floorspace would produce 62,558 new jobs, bringing the overall number of jobs across NEC to 71,642. This scenario sees the number of homes reduced to 7,395, with 5,273 of these new homes proposed to be delivered within the plan period to 2041.
  - **Scenario 3: Cambridge Wastewater Treatment Plant will remain in situ** - this scenario would result in a very different vision for overall development at NEC. It would see the number of homes that can be delivered dramatically reduced, and the infrastructure demands will fall significantly as a result. Only sites outside the odour zone of the

CWWTP would likely provide housing, with an estimate of only 90 units across the whole of the NEC area. The remainder of site are likely to seek to intensify the provision of commercial floorspace, with potential to deliver a further c.1.1 million sqm providing an additional 60,000 jobs.

## Evidence

- 2.15 The updated NEC IDP can be viewed and commented upon as part of the consultation documents: *Link will be added when draft plan is published.*
- 2.16 Alongside the updated NEC IDP, the Councils have also commissioned an updated Viability Assessment, taking account of the increase in infrastructure costs as a result of inflation and work done to update and refine the mitigation required. The updated NEC Viability Assessment continues to demonstrate the draft policy and infrastructure requirements would not render planned development unviable. The updated Viability Assessment can be viewed and commented upon as part of the consultation documents: *Link will be added when draft plan is published.*
- 2.17 The [North East Cambridge Transport Position Statement \(January 2025\)](#) outlines the strategic and local transport mitigation strategy required by Policy S/NEC to demonstrate that the proposed development can be delivered within the identified vehicle trip budget. Ahead of the Proposed Submission stage, the Statement will be updated to incorporate refined scheme cost estimates and to reflect changes in the development context.
- 2.18 **Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, Areas of Search Assessment and Guidance: Appendix D:** Through initial building height testing, the study concludes that the site sits within a limited number of Strategic Viewpoints and is therefore there is some opportunity for additional height and mass which makes a positive contribution to the Cambridge Skyline. Generally, building heights on the edges of the site that are below 19m are unlikely to have adverse impacts on the skyline, whilst development around 32m may be suitable, subject to further testing at the planning application stage.
- 2.19 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1, but parts of the site are within 100 metres of Flood Zone 2. Areas of the site are within 100 metres of Flood Zone 2. Some areas of the site are at high, medium or low risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with notable areas of the site being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the surface level, but this does not indicate the

magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. A very small proportion of the site has historically flooded. Given the size of the site, it is likely that built development can be situated outside of areas of high flood risk using a sequential approach to the site's design. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

- 2.20 As outlined above, three alternative approaches are being considered for NEC as a result of the uncertainty over the relocation of the CWWTP. The potential scenario where the CWWTP remains in situ, even if modernised and on a reduced footprint, will drastically alter the regeneration potential of the area and the shared vision for place the Council's set out in the Proposed Submission Draft of the AAP.
- 2.21 Given the significant benefits that a comprehensive mixed-use development at NEC would bring, the Council's are continuing to explore alternative funding to enable the relocation of the CWWTP. The current draft NEC Policy in the Draft Local Plan therefore continues to promote the vision and objectives sought for the area in the Proposed Submission Draft of the AAP, taking account of changing over the past four years.

### **Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations**

- 2.22 The Councils still support the relocation of the existing CWWTP to facilitate comprehensive redevelopment of the NEC area. As one of the last strategic brownfield opportunities in the city, the Councils consider it appropriate that higher density development be promoted to make the most of this opportunity to help meet the development needs of Greater Cambridge in a highly accessible location. This does mean more flats than housing and less formal open spaces (such as sports fields and allotments) will be provided on-site but off-set against the range of benefits that high quality compact living can bring in terms of a more sustainable and liveable environment that fosters inclusion and social interaction, ease of access, and a range of amenities that contribute to a better quality of life for residents.

## Further work and next steps

2.23 The Councils will continue to pursue alternative funding options for the relocation of the CWWTP. The success and certainty of any funding arrangement will determine the future development options to be taken forward for NEC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

## Policy S/LAC: Other site allocations in Cambridge

### Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to

2.24 To help meet the need for new housing and jobs in Greater Cambridge by identifying specific site allocations for housing, employment or mixed use development in the Cambridge urban area.

### How was the issue covered in the First Proposals Consultation?

2.25 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [Policy S/LAC: Other site allocations in Cambridge | Greater Cambridge Shared Planning](#)

2.26 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: [Strategy Topic Paper](#)

### Policy context update

2.27 National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2024, including changes to Green Belt policy, and guidance regarding development density.

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

2.28 Issues raised in the representations include:

- **Proposed approach to site allocations:**
  - General support for the proposed approach to site allocations in Cambridge urban area, however suggestions included:
    - more homes should be identified in Cambridge to reduce the homes identified in rural areas,

- fewer homes should be identified in the urban area in light of the pandemic and need for more personal and recreational space, and
  - existing adopted allocations should be reviewed and not automatically carried forward, and assurance provided regarding their delivery and ability to meet housing need.
- **Rejected or de-allocated sites:**
    - Support for the rejection of specific sites and de-allocation of sites from an individual and a residents association, and
    - Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.
- **Site specific comments:**
    - **Garages between 20 St Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge (S/C/SMS):**
      - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
      - protect and preserve the mature tree on the eastern edge of the site, and
      - consider impact of this development on water/sewerage capacity.
    - **137-143 Histon Road, Cambridge (S/C/R2):**
      - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.
    - **Henry Giles House, 73-79 Chesterton Road, Cambridge (S/C/R4):**
      - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.
    - **Camfields Resource Centre and Oil Depot, 137-139 Ditton Walk, Cambridge (S/C/R5):**
      - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.
    - **636-656 Newmarket Road, Holy Cross Church Hall, East Barnwell Community Centre and Meadowlands, Newmarket Road, Cambridge (S/C/R6):**
      - need to provide assurance regarding delivery.
    - **Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road, Cambridge (S/C/R9):**
      - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,

- site promoter is seeking amendments as consider the site appropriate for a mix of uses and a higher number of dwellings, and
  - site promoter supports the allocation.
- **Horizon Resource Centre, 285 Coldham's Lane, Cambridge (R11):**
  - landowner requests that the allocation is carried forward and not de-allocated.
- **Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Foster Road, Cambridge (R16):**
  - landowner requests that the allocation is carried forward and not de-allocated.
- **Grange Farm, off Wilberforce Road, Cambridge (S/C/U3):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.
- **Police Station, Parkside, Cambridge (S/C/M4):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
  - landowner is challenging the Building for Local Interest status,
  - landowner is seeking amendments to allow flexibility for a mix of uses, and
  - landowner supports the allocation.
- **Fen Road, Cambridge (RM1 and Policy H7):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.
- **Land south of Coldham's Lane, Cambridge (S/C/SCL):**
  - concerns about impact of lorries, traffic and congestion on surrounding roads,
  - objection from The Wildlife Trust as includes development on a City Wildlife Site,
  - suggestion that site should be used to provide accessible green space,
  - negative impact on biodiversity and risk of harm to adjoining land identified for ecological uses,
  - need for flexibility in the uses proposed to enable complementary uses to be provided,
  - insufficient information on management and funding of proposed urban country park, and
  - landowner supports the allocation.
- **1 and 7-11 Hills Road, Cambridge (E5):**

- landowner requests that the allocation is carried forward and not de-allocated.
- **S/C/BFS: Brookfields**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.
- **Clifton Road Area, Cambridge (S/C/M2):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
  - site promoter would like to work with the Councils to gather evidence of deliverability, and
  - landowner supports the allocation.
- **82-88 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman Street, Cambridge (S/C/M5):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
  - landowner is seeking amendments to include additional land at 90 Hills Road, and
  - landowner supports the allocation.
- **Station Road West, Cambridge (S/C/M14):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.
- **Betjeman House, Hills Road, Cambridge (S/C/M44):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
  - landowner is seeking amendments so that the allocation is for commercial uses only, and
  - landowner supports the allocation.
- **Old Press / Mill Lane, Cambridge (S/C/U1):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording, and
  - landowner supports the allocation.
- **New Museums Site, Downing Street, Cambridge (S/C/U2):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording, and
  - landowner supports the allocation.

2.29 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement.

## **Draft Policy, Reasons and Alternatives considered**

### **Draft Policy**

2.30 Policy S/LAC identifies the list of sites that are allocated for housing, employment or mixed uses in the Cambridge urban area, and the specific development requirements for each site that should be met alongside all other relevant Local Plan policy requirements. It highlights that the number of homes or floorspace included in the policy is indicative and that what is permitted should be determined through a design-led approach at the planning application stage.

### **Reasons for draft policy approach**

2.31 The Local Plan must allocate sites for new housing and employment development to meet the long term housing needs of Greater Cambridge and support the forecast new jobs in the area. The majority of new homes and jobs will be delivered at the strategic sites on the edge of Cambridge and at the new settlements. However, given that Cambridge urban area is the most sustainable location in Greater Cambridge, sites have been allocated for housing, employment and mixed use developments to make the most of its accessibility to existing jobs, services and public transport.

2.32 The assessment of all sites considered in Cambridge urban area, including reasons for their allocation or rejection, is set out in Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 7: Review of sites to inform identification of allocations. The site specific reasons for the allocation of each site are set out in the draft policy and reasons section of the specific allocation in the Individual Site Allocations section. The identified specific development requirements for each of the sites are necessary to ensure that the likely impacts of the development will be adequately mitigated, and have been informed by the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment , Heritage Impact Assessments any relevant planning permission(s) and any other relevant evidence.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

2.33 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

2.34 Responses to general issues raised in representations include:

- more or fewer homes should be identified in Cambridge: Cambridge urban area is the most sustainable location in Greater Cambridge, and

sites have been allocated to make the most of its accessibility to existing jobs, services and public transport. A variety of sites have been considered through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment process and assessed against the development strategy for the Local Plan, and those sites identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated. All new residential developments will be required to meet relevant Local Plan requirements such as internal space and open space standards.

- existing adopted allocations should be reviewed: all adopted allocations have been reviewed alongside new sites, and those that continue to be identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated.
- support for the rejection of specific sites, support for de-allocation of sites and requests for specific sites to be allocated: new or updated evidence and representations received to the First Proposals consultation have all been considered, and those sites that continue to be identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated.

2.35 The landowner of 1 and 7-11 Hills Road (E5) has requested that this allocation is carried forward and not de-allocated. However the sites are in existing commercial use, and the Greater Cambridge Employment and Housing Evidence Update (2023) suggested they should be deallocated. If proposals do come forward they are capable of being considered through the planning application process.

2.36 The response to issues raised in representations relating to other specific sites are included in the response to issues raised in representations section of the specific allocation in the Individual Site Allocations section.

## Individual site allocations in the Cambridge Urban Area

### Homes

[Policy S/C/SMS: Garages between 20 St. Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge](#)

### New or updated evidence

2.37 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes the key issues of this brownfield site are the risk of impacting the character and setting of the Mill Road Conservation Area, the Mill Road Cemetery Registered Park and Garden and the nearby Listed Buildings. The site is immediately adjacent to

the Mill Road Conservation Area and shares some intervisibility with the Church of St Matthew Grade II Listed Building as such the implementation of design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building heights (at or below local prevailing building heights), style, and materials, should limit impacts on the setting of designated assets. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

2.38 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are very small areas of the site at low risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with the whole site area being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

2.39 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The Garages between 20 St. Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge is a newly proposed site allocation. There is no relevant planning application. The site is surrounded by predominately residential buildings, with some ground floor retail units. The character is predominately buildings of 2-3 storeys. The site submission and site-specific evidence have been considered and reflective of the context, the indicative capacity of approximately 12 homes (120 dwellings per hectare) reflects the constrained urban nature of the site, protected trees, footpath and registered historic assets, whilst making the best use of the site sustainable urban location.

## Response to issues raised in representations

2.40 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Historic England state the need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording – A Heritage Impact Assessment has now been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirement added to the policy.
- Must protect and preserve the mature tree on the eastern edge of the site - a development requirement has been added to the policy, requiring the mature tree to be retained.
- Consider impact of this development on water/sewerage capacity - this allocation and the wider Local Plan has been considered by the respective utility providers as part of the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Any deficiencies in water and sewerage capacity as a result of any of

the allocations will be addressed under site specific requirements and mitigation measures be secured and delivered through a legal agreement at the planning application stage.

## Policy S/C/HTR: 137-143 Histon Road

### New or updated evidence

- 2.41 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA recommends that design-based mitigation is required to limit potential impacts on the local and wider skyline, townscape character and setting of listed buildings. This should include measures to manage building heights and mass and ensure use of appropriate materials. Development at a scale similar to the local prevailing building height may be appropriate. The site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.42 Planning permission:** Prior approval for the demolition and removal of buildings and above ground level structures was granted on the part of the site known as 'Former Murketts Garage Site 137 Histon Road' on 7 June 2023 (23/01842/PRIOR). A large proportion of the site, which excludes land associated with the ATS Eurostar garage, has full planning permission (24/01354/FUL) for the erection of 70 dwellings. This was approved in March 2025.
- 2.43 Further consideration of site capacity:** The site submission and site-specific evidence have been considered and the indicative overall site capacity of approximately 100 homes (85 dwellings per hectare) reflects the need to vary the height and density of development across different parts of the site whilst making best use of land in a highly sustainable location. This site has a planning application on 80% of the site under 24/01354/FUL delivering 70 units over 1.18 hectares which is 60 dwellings per hectare. The garage site on the remaining parcel of the site allocation will need to deliver 30 dwellings, at approximately 165 dwellings per hectare. This variation in density is supported in policy. The ATS Eurostar garage is not currently available for development within the first 0-5 years of the plan.

### Response to issues raised in representations

- 2.44 Responses to issues raised in representations include:
- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact

Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirement added to the policy.

## Policy S/C/HGH: Henry Giles House, 73-79 Chesterton Road

### New or updated evidence

- 2.45 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that this is a previously developed site on the periphery of the Historic Core of Cambridge and within Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area. The site is immediately adjacent to the Grade II Listed Buildings associated with Jesus Lock and two Telephone Kiosks. There is an Historic Environment Record (HER) Feature within the site in the form of an extant structure: the Cambridge Instrument Company. The HIA considers that the current building form of the site detracts from the setting and character of the Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area and therefore there may be opportunities for design to enhance the character and setting of heritage assets. More generally, the implementation of design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building height, style, and materials, should limit impacts on the setting of designated assets, however, should prevailing heights be exceeded this could increase risk. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.46 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1, but parts of the site are within 100 metres of Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. The nearby flood zones fall within the area of parkland (Jesus Green) to the south of the river, which is at a lower-lying topography compared to the site. There are no records of historical flooding within the site. The site is a former allocation in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 2.47 **Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and site-specific evidence have been considered and the indicative capacity of approximately 50 homes (100 dwellings per hectare) reflects the importance of maintaining views across Jesus Green, a positive contribution to townscape character, low level of parking provision and a mix of housing types and tenures.
- 2.48 The proposed allocation excludes Carlyle House, which was included in the allocation within the Cambridge Local Plan (2018). Full planning permission (24/02728/FUL) was approved in October 2024 for external alterations to

Carlyle House to enable it to be used as an NHS healthcare facility, with the change of use from offices to medical or health services being permitted development. The landowner has advised that it is their intention to retain the building for healthcare uses in the short term as the building is currently let, but intends to bring the site forward for housing at some point in the future. At this stage there is too much uncertainty that the site will come forward for residential development to include it as part of the allocation.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

2.49 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirement added to the policy.

### **Policy S/C/HRC: Horizon Resource Centre, 285 Coldham's Lane**

#### **New or updated evidence**

2.50 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA): The HIA recommends that design-based mitigation is required to limit the impacts on the setting of designated assets and urbanising impacts on Coldham's Common. This should include measures primarily in the form of building height, style, and materials. Development at a scale similar to the local prevailing building height may be appropriate, as should prevailing heights be exceeded this could increase risk. Site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings. Archaeological investigation (starting with desk-based assessment) will be required to identify the presence and significance of as yet unknown archaeological remains across the site. Further mitigation could include avoidance and preservation in situ, further investigation, or recording depending on the significance of any remains found. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

2.51 Updated Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) for the site: The site was not included within the First Proposals (November to December 2021), as it was previously uncertain whether site would still come forward for residential uses by 2045. A new site (59379), was submitted by the landowner during the first Proposals consultation in November and December 2021 with an amended area to the southern boundary. This submission has changed the overall assessment outcome and now confirms that the site is deliverable and developable; the rating for suitability remains Amber. It also highlights, through a number of amber rated subcategories, that particular

consideration needs to be given to Flood Risk, Contaminated Land, Air Quality, Noise/Vibration/Odour and Light Pollution, Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Site Access. These sub-categories would need to be addressed by the developer as part of the application. The site area has been revised to 0.73ha to reflect this submission and development requirements have been added into the policy where necessary.

- 2.52 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. Parts of the site are within 100 metres of Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. Notable areas of the site are at high, medium or low risk of surface water flooding. The whole of the site has potential for groundwater flooding to occur at the surface level. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a medium risk of flooding, and the site-specific flood risks and opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 2.53 Further consideration of site capacity: the site submission and site-specific evidence have been considered. The new site submission to the first Proposals consultation in November and December 2021 amended the site area to the southern boundary. However, the indicative capacity of approximately 40 homes (55 dwellings per hectare) has been carried forward from the adopted Cambridge Local Plan which was found 'sound'. The capacity reflects the local townscape context whilst limiting the impact on the setting of designated assets and sites, Coldhams Common, existing vegetation and archaeology.

### Response to issues raised in representations

- 2.54 Responses to issues raised in representations include:
- Landowner requests that the allocation is carried forward and not de-allocated  
- The site has been identified in the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

### Policy S/C/PDC: Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Foster Road

#### New or updated evidence

- 2.55 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that although the site is less than 10 metres from Trumpington Conservation Area (characterised by the grand manor houses of Trumpington Hall and Anstey Hall and 19th-20<sup>th</sup>

century houses within the wider area) it is mostly obscured from the Conservation Area by the intervening townscape. Therefore, any tall development on this site may intrude into the setting and character, but assuming that heights are maintained close to the local prevailing building height and existing building heights on site, and that new buildings are of a sympathetic and high-quality design there is a low risk of impacting the character of the Trumpington Conservation Area. A key consideration is the framed view down Alpha Terrace into the site, this will require careful design. Site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings and archaeological mitigation may be required for this site. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

**2.56 Updated Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA)**

**for the site:** A new site (59387) was submitted during the first Proposals consultation in November and December 2021 for 67 dwellings on a site of 1.49ha. The amended area to the North/North East boundary was assessed. The overall assessment outcome now confirms that the site is deliverable and developable; the rating for suitability remains Amber. The HELAA has a number of amber ratings for various sub-categories, which need to be addressed by the developer as part of the application. Development requirements have been added into the policy.

**2.57 Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and site-specific evidence have been considered and the indicative capacity of approximately 40 homes (45 dwellings per hectare) reflects a decrease from the indicative capacity in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and from the previous HELAA Assessment (OS042). This change reflects the developable area of the site at 1.05ha, which is due to the need to exclude the protected open space to east of the site and a triangle of land (through which PROW is cited) to the southwest corner from the developable area. The indicative capacity for approximately 40 homes reflects the need to preserve the POS around the eastern edge of the site and a reasonable landscape buffer placed between the proposed development and the playing fields. The removal of a triangle of land in south-west corner from the developable area allows for the retention of a PROW, the retention of existing trees on-site, and provides opportunities for sufficient set-back from adjacent properties. The site capacity has therefore been amended due to these constraints.

**Response to issues raised in representations**

**2.58 Responses to issues raised in representations include:** Landowner requests that the allocation is carried forward and not de-allocated – The site has been proposed to be allocated.

## Policy S/C/PPS: Police Station, Parkside

### New or updated evidence

- 2.59 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that it is a highly sensitive site, currently detracting from the character of the Historic Core of Cambridge, the Kite Conservation Area, and Central Conservation Area, as well as the setting of a series of listed buildings and locally listed buildings. Design-based mitigation including restricting building heights to four storeys and ensuring design is sympathetic to the local 19th century building style should enable the delivery of housing on site. There is opportunity for redevelopment of the site to positively contribute to the local area. The key issues for this site are the risk of impacting Viewpoint 1 (Castle Hill Mound), and the setting and character of the historic core, the Kite Conservation Area, Parker's Piece, historic landmark buildings and Statutory and Locally Listed Buildings. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.60 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are notable areas at low risk of surface water flooding across the site. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with some areas of the site being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level and at surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 2.61 **Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and site-specific evidence have been considered and the indicative capacity of approximately 50 homes (102 dwellings per hectare) reflects the local context, whilst preserving and enhancing the character of the Conservation Areas, Parker's Piece, historic landmark buildings, and adjacent Statutory and Locally Listed Buildings. The site capacity has been carried forward from the adopted Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which was found 'sound'.

### Response to issues raised in representations

- 2.62 Responses to issues raised in representations include:
- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirement added to the policy.

- Landowner is challenging the Building of Local Interest status - there is no process for removing BLI status and the HELAA and HIA confirm the importance of retaining the Building of Local Interest.
- Landowner is seeking amendments to allow flexibility for a mix of uses – policy allows for other uses as part of a residential-led scheme.

## Policy SC/NCA: North Cambridge Academy, Arbury Road

### New or Updated Evidence

- 2.63 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that development of the site has a low risk to impacting listed heritage assets within the local area. Nevertheless, there is a need for careful consideration of building heights to ensure potential impacts on local and wider skyline and townscape character are mitigated. The HIA also states that archaeological investigation will be required to identify the presence and significance of archaeological remains across the site, with potential mitigation measures needed where necessary. Overall the residual risk to heritage assets is considered to be low. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.64 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. Some areas of the site have planning permission for development. There are areas of the site at high, medium and low risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with the whole site area being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 2.65 **Further consideration of site capacity:** This is a new site submission. The site is partially in use as a community college with associated indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A proportion of the site is previously developed land which was formally a language school before it ceased operation and was subsequently demolished. The land to the northwest of the site was designated as Protected Open Space in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018). This open space designation was in relation to the language school which now no longer exists within the site. It is not accessible to the public and the site promoter and local education authority have advised the land is not in use for educational purposes and is therefore surplus to requirements. The wider

site is still proposed to be used by North Cambridge Academy, and the Academy has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity to further expand the school if required in the future.

- 2.66 The site promoter has suggested that the site can accommodate between 130 and 168 net residential units, comprising of a mix of market, affordable, key worker dwellings and student accommodation. At this stage, the Councils consider that around 150 units can be adequately provided given the site is in close proximity to a range of services and facilities Arbury Court Local Centre, at a density of around 100 dwellings per hectare. Nevertheless, further work will need to be undertaken to confirm the capacity for the site for the next stage of Plan making.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

This is a new site submission; therefore, no earlier representations have been received.

### **Policy S/C/ER: 1-99 Ekin Road and 1-8 Ekin Walk**

#### **New or Updated Evidence base**

- 2.67 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA has identified tall buildings on the site have the potential to impact negatively on the setting of Fen Ditton Conservation Area and it is recommended that building heights reflect local prevailing heights to preserve the views available from the common. Limiting development height will also reduce the likelihood of any impacts on the strategic viewpoints, as building at height could feature in a number of these. Residual risk is considered to be low. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.68 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are very small areas of the site at low risk or medium risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with the whole site area being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 2.69 **Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and site-specific evidence have been considered, and the indicative capacity of the site is for

approximately 26 additional homes, based on 54 dwellings per hectare. This reflects the constrained urban nature of the site whilst making the best use of the site's sustainable urban location through a modest increase in prevailing densities.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

2.70 Not applicable as this site was not within the Local Plan First Proposals.

### **Policy S/C/DR: 2-28 Davy Road and Garage Blocks**

#### **New or Updated Evidence base**

- 2.71 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA)** The HIA has identified that the site is within 200 metres of two Conservation Areas and a single Grade II Listed Building. Additionally, there are a number of locally listed assets within close proximity to the site. The implementation of design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building height, style, and materials, should limit impacts on the setting of the Conservation Areas; however, should prevailing heights be exceeded or unsympathetic design be used this could increase risk. Archaeological mitigation will also be required. Residual risk is considered to be low. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.72 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are areas of the site at low, medium or high risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur across the whole site, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 2.73 **Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and site-specific evidence have been considered and the indicative capacity of the site is for approximately 48 additional homes, based on 75 dwellings per hectare. This reflects the constrained urban nature of the site, protection of the open space and retention of mature trees, whilst making the best use of the site's sustainable urban location.

## Response to issues raised in representations

Not applicable as this site was not within the Local Plan First Proposals.

## Policy S/C/HPC: 1-78 Hanover Court, 1-49 Princess Court and Garage at Newtown Garages

### New or Updated Evidence base

- 2.74 **Heritage Impact Assessment:** The HIA has identified that the site is close to a Botanic Garden Registered Park and Garden and is within the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area and 125 metres south of the Central Cambridge Conservation Area. There are a substantial number of listed heritage assets within close proximity to the site. The implementation of design-based mitigation, in the form of building heights and screening, should limit impacts on the setting of designated assets; however, should prevailing heights be exceeded this could increase risk. There are opportunities for design to enhance character and setting of heritage assets. Archaeological mitigation will be required. Residual risk is considered to be moderate. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.75 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. A notable part of the site has a low risk of surface water flooding and there are also smaller areas at a medium risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with the whole site being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 2.76 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The site submission and site-specific evidence have been considered, and an indicative site capacity of approximately 37 additional homes is considered at this stage to be reasonable, based on the highly sustainable location of the site and the nature of the existing development on the site. Development would result densities of around 200 dwellings per hectare. Nevertheless, further work will need to be undertaken to confirm the capacity for the site for the next stage of Plan making whilst addressing potential adverse impacts on the built and natural environment.

2.77 **Planning permissions:** 25/00507/SCRE a request for an Environmental Impact Assessment screening option has been submitted for up to 180 homes and a community centre. Awaiting decision.

#### **Response to issues raised in representations**

2.78 Not applicable as this site was not within the Local Plan First Proposals.

#### **Policy S/C/GER: Former Garage Block, East Road**

##### **New or Updated Evidence**

2.79 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA has identified that the site is on periphery of Historic Core, immediately adjacent Mill Road Conservation Area and within the setting of the Church of St Matthew. The implementation of design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building height, style, and materials, should limit impacts on the setting of designated assets, however, should development exceed the prevailing heights in the area, there would be an increased risk to heritage harm. There are opportunities for design to enhance character and setting of heritage assets through new development. Archaeological mitigation may be required. Residual risk is considered to be low/moderate. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

2.80 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with the whole site area being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

2.81 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The site submission and site-specific evidence have been considered, and an indicative site capacity of approximately 40 homes is considered at this stage to be reasonable, based on the highly sustainable location of the site. Development would result densities of around 285 dwellings per hectare. Nevertheless, further work will need to be undertaken to confirm the capacity for the site for the next stage of Plan making whilst addressing potential adverse impacts on the built and natural environment.

#### **Response to issues raised in representations**

2.82 Not applicable as this site was not within the Local Plan First Proposals.

## S/C/SH: 1 - 33 Stanton House, Christchurch Street

### New or Updated Evidence

- 2.83 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA has identified that the site is adjacent to the Kite Conservation Area to the north. The implementation of design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building height, style, and materials, should limit impacts on the setting of the Conservation Area, however, should prevailing heights be exceeded or unsympathetic design be used this could increase risk. Archaeological mitigation will be required. Residual risk is considered to be low/moderate. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.84 **Planning Permission:** Prior Approval applied for under 25/02139/PRIOR for the demolition of existing sheltered housing scheme comprising 33 one bedroom flats and adjoining wardens house. Prior Approval has been applied for and assessed as not required because it satisfies the relevant requirements and conditions of Schedule 2, Part 11, Class B of the GPDO and prior approval is not required.
- 2.85 **Further consideration of site capacity:** This is a new site submission in February 2025. The site located at Stanton Place, was in former use as sheltered accommodation managed by Cambridge City Council. It has however been concluded that the buildings are no longer suitable for purpose and is currently vacant. The site has been promoted for 29 units (gross), which is a net loss of 5 units from the existing number of units on the site. This is part is due to the proposal for an intended improved standard of accommodation from the existing. Due to the location and context of the site, and constraints related to the Conservation Area, the proposal for an indicative capacity of 29 units is considered reasonable but would require further consideration at the planning application stage.

### Response to issues raised in representations

- 2.86 Not applicable as this site was not within the Local Plan First Proposals.

## Employment

### S/C/SCL: Land South of Coldham's Lane, Cambridge

#### New or updated evidence

- 2.87 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that this is a greenfield site, which has no designated heritage assets. It also states that there is Grade I Listed Building, the church of St Andrew, and four Grade II Listed Buildings, including three 16th – 18th century houses and the churchyard wall of St Andrews, are within 500 metres of the site. There are also 8 Locally Listed Buildings within 500 metres of the site, and these buildings mainly comprise 19th century residential properties and part of St Bede's school. The HIA notes that the key issues for this site are the risk of impacting Strategic Viewpoint 10- Cherry Hinton Road roundabout, overlooking Cambridge Airport. The HIA recommends implementing design-based mitigation, appropriate massing, and ensuring building heights are no taller than 6 storeys to ensure there aren't negative impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets or Strategic Viewpoint 7 – Little Trees Hill, Magog Down and Viewpoint 10. The HIA also notes that there is moderate potential for significant archaeology on the site. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.88 **Planning Permission:** Outline planning permission was approved for Offices (Use Class E(g)(i)), Research and Development (Use Class E(g)(ii)), ancillary retail & facilities (Use Classes E(a) and E(b)), car and cycle parking, landscape and public realm, infrastructure and associated works, all other matters reserved except for access on 19 September 2024 (23/04590/OUT).
- 2.89 **Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and analysis of the capacity of similar sites has been used to determine an indicative floorspace for this allocation. The proposed indicative capacity draws from the approved planning application.

#### Response to issues raised in representations

- 2.90 Responses to issues raised in representations include:
- Concerns about impact of lorries, traffic and congestion on surrounding roads - The HELAA considered the highways impacts associated with the proposal, including consultation with the Local Highway Authority. It concluded that there could potentially be an impact upon local roads, but these could be mitigated. In the policy, it is set out that the developer will be expected to contribute to sustainable modes of transport.
  - Objection from The Wildlife Trust as includes development on a City Wildlife Site - The HELAA considered the impact of prospective development on the site and noted that development of the site might have

a detrimental impact on a designated site, or those with a regional or local protection. However, the HELAA also notes that these impacts could be reasonably mitigated. Therefore, a key development requirement of the policy is the request that future development decontaminates the site and implements ecological enhancements.

- Suggestion that site should be used to provide accessible green space – Development on the site will enable for the restoration and opening up of the wider site.
- Negative impact on biodiversity and risk of harm to adjoining land identified for ecological uses - The HELAA considered the impact of prospective development on the site and noted that development of the site might have a detrimental impact on a designated site, or those with a regional or local protection. However, the HELAA also notes that these impacts could be reasonably mitigated. Therefore, a key development requirement of the policy is to request that development decontaminates the site and implements ecological enhancements.
- Need for flexibility in the uses proposed to enable complementary uses to be provided - the uses reflect opportunities provided by the site and the extant planning permission.
- Insufficient information on management and funding of proposed urban country park - The level of detail regarding the requirement is appropriate to a policy set out in the local plan, and detail regarding the land management and maintenance can be refined through the planning application process and section 106.

## Mixed Use

### S/C/BRN: Land at Barnwell Road and Newmarket Road

#### New or updated evidence

**2.91 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment for site OS272:** A HELAA assessment was undertaken having amended the site boundary to include the bowls club and exclude the Cambridge Spiritualist Centre, which is not available for development during the Plan period. The assessment was based partly on the existing planning permission for part of the site and the redevelopment of the Community Centre, Church and Church Hall and their re-provision with additional residential development. The HELAA assessment identified that whilst most issues could be overcome, the site currently contains two areas of Protected Open Space, the bowls club and a multi-use games area. The policy has therefore included the necessary requirements to ensure these assets are either re-provided on site and/or relocated within the local area.

- 2.92 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes this brownfield site is surrounded by predominantly modern development. The implementation of design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building height, style, and materials, should limit impacts on the setting of designated assets, however, should prevailing heights be exceeded this could increase risk. There are opportunities for design to enhance character and setting of heritage assets. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.93 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that some of the site has planning permission. The site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are very small areas of the site at low risk or high risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with the whole site area being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 2.94 **Planning Permission:** Full planning permission (23/04687/FUL) was approved on 29 November 2024 for the redevelopment of the existing local centre, 634-656 Newmarket Road and the nearby bowls club to provide a new community centre, library, pre-school, shops and/ or café and/ or commercial space, 120 homes, car parking, cycle parking, landscaping and associated works, following the demolition of existing buildings. The Bowls Club was, through the planning permission, relocated to Abbey Leisure Centre.
- 2.95 Land at 1-6 The Green has full planning permission (19/1048/FUL and 23/01850/S73) for the siting of 5 temporary homes to provide accommodation for homeless people together with 1 temporary home for a warden/key worker until March 2028.
- 2.96 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The site submission and site-specific evidence (including planning permission 23/04687/FUL) have been considered and the indicative capacity of approximately 172 homes (154 net additional) and 500 square metres commercial reflects the revised site boundary and the need to avoid building heights that would impact viewpoint 11 (Ditton Meadows) identified in the Heritage Impact Assessment.
- 2.97 The boundary of the allocation has been amended to include the land at the local centre and bowls club to reflect the area covered by the planning

permission, and to exclude the Cambridge Spiritualist Centre as this part of the wider area is not deliverable or developable.

## Response to issues raised in representations

2.98 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Need to provide assurance regarding delivery – the majority of the development site is owned and being brought forward by Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council; planning permission (23/04687/FUL) has been approved for part of the site and it is anticipated that this part of the site will be delivered within the next 5 years.

## S/C/TRP: Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road

New or updated evidence

2.99 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA recommends that design-based mitigation is required to limit potential impacts on the local and wider skyline, townscape character and setting of listed buildings. This should include measures to manage building heights and mass and ensure use of appropriate materials. Development at a scale similar to, or less than, the local prevailing height of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Mill Road Conservation Area may be appropriate particularly along Mill Road and Devonshire Road. The HIA notes that the key issues for this site are the risk of impacting the character of the Mill Road Conservation Area, and the setting of the David Parr House Listed Building and Cambridge City Branch Library Listed Building. The site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings. There are opportunities to improve the setting of the Conservation Areas due to redevelopment of a building which is currently a detracting element. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

2.100 **Planning permission:** Full Planning permission was approved on 24 May 2023 for demolition of the existing depot building and redevelopment of site to provide three new buildings comprising Class E (g) (i) / E (g) (ii) floorspace, two new residential buildings comprising 70 residential units, one new building comprising flexible commercial space (Class E) to include a creche and flexible community space (Class F.1 / F.2), hard and soft landscaping and associated access. Mix of uses amended and indicative capacity of homes increased.

2.101 **Further consideration of site capacity:** site specific evidence (including planning permission 22/01982/FUL) and the existing allocation (Site R9), have been considered. The indicative capacity of approximately 70 homes (56.9

dwellings per hectare) reflects, within a mixed use scheme, the opportunity to deliver homes in a sustainable location. Also, the site capacity reflects the local context whilst limiting potential impacts to the Mill Road Conservation Area, the local and wider skyline, townscape character and setting of listed buildings. The site submission has been used to determine an indicative floorspace for this allocation.

**2.102** The site was allocated in the 2018 Cambridge Local Plan as residential, but consideration through the planning application process (22/01982/FUL) has confirmed the site is suitable for a mixed use scheme and the allocation reflects this.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

2.103 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirement added to the policy.
- Developer / promoter has asked for site to be allocated for mixed use – full planning permission (22/01982/FUL) granted in May 2023 for 70 dwellings and a mix of non-residential uses. Mix of uses amended, indicative capacity of homes increased and suitability of site for class uses E (g) (i) / E (g) (ii), F.1 and F.2. added to the policy.

### **S/C/OPK: Orchard Park**

#### **New or updated evidence**

2.104 Planning permission: The parcel of land Com4 has full planning permission (22/01632/FUL) approved on 12 July 2024 for an 80 room aparthotel and 137 room hotel with the addition of mixed-use facilities, the erection of a building above a basement, car parking, landscaping, and other associated works. The mixed use facilities include a gym, swimming pool, conference rooms and co-office working facilities.

2.105 Further consideration of site capacity: site specific evidence, including extant planning permissions have informed the site capacity.

#### **Response to issues raised in representations**

2.106 No representations were submitted relating to this allocation in the First Proposals consultation.

## S/C/BFS: Brookfields

### New or updated evidence

- 2.107 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA describes the site as a brownfield site situated within the Mill Road Conservation Area. Two locally listed buildings, which formed the 19<sup>th</sup> century Brookfields Hospital, are located within the site. Within 500 metres of the site area, there are 26 locally listed buildings. The HIA states that development should be at a scale similar to, and not less than, prevailing building heights. It states that if development exceeds 3.5 storeys, there is a moderate risk of harm to Strategic Viewpoint 8 (Limekiln Road), Strategic Viewpoint 9 (Worts Causeway / Shelford Road), and Viewpoint 10 (Cherry Hinton Roundabout, overlooking Cambridge Airport), as well as having a moderate risk of eroding the character of the Mill Road Conservation Area. The HIA recommends implementing design-based mitigation, including measures to manage building heights, massing, and ensuring appropriate materials are used. The HIA also recommends retaining the sanatorium buildings to avoid significant impact on the character of the area. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.108 **Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment for site OS046a:** The HELAA was updated to reflect the fact that part of the site has been constructed. The updated HELAA did not change the original HELAA assessment outcome; the site continues to rate as amber for suitability, green for availability, and green for achievability. The updated HELAA has rated some sub-categories as amber, including flood risk, landscape and townscape, biodiversity and geodiversity, site access, noise, vibration, odour and light pollution, air quality, contamination, and ground stability. These issues will need to be addressed by the developer when designing and assessing the suitability of proposals for the site's development. Development requirements have been added to the policy.
- 2.109 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that some areas of the site have planning permission and construction of the approved development has commenced. The site comprises land that has been allocated for development in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018). The site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. Part of the site is within 100 metres of Flood Zone 2. There are notable areas of the site at high, medium and low risk of surface water flooding. The whole of the site has potential for groundwater flooding to occur at the surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-

specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

2.110 **Further consideration of site capacity:** This site was previously allocated as part of the 2018 Local Plan. Since then, some of the original allocation has been built out. Therefore, the site boundary and development capacity for this continued allocation have been altered to reflect this change in planning context.

2.111 The site submission and site-specific evidence have been considered. The site is in a highly sustainable location and an indicative capacity of 3,400 net additional square metres of floorspace is considered achievable given known heritage, landscape and townscape constraints. However, this would need to be confirmed through a pre-application process which will need to carefully consider the heritage assets and protected trees on the site.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

2.112 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirement added to the policy.

### **S/C/CJ: Cambridge Junction and Cambridge Leisure, Hills Road**

#### **New or updated evidence**

2.113 **Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment for site OS271:** A HELAA assessment was undertaken for the land including Cambridge Junction, Cambridge Leisure and adjacent plots. This was consistent with the landowner/freeholder boundary in this area. The assessment identified that a number of issues would need to be overcome should the site come forward for development, but that these could be addressed through further studies and/or design mitigation. The policy has therefore included the necessary site specific requirements to make redevelopment of this site suitable in planning terms.

2.114 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that design based mitigation is required to manage potential impacts on Strategic Viewpoints

and that this should include measures to manage building heights and mass. New development should not exceed prevailing building heights, given that current heights and mass of buildings are considerable features on the skyline and that scaling down towards the edges of development would also be appropriate to soften local impacts. Mass of new development should also be organised to avoid a 'block' effect and in combination, this will avoid new development becoming overly prominent in the Strategic Viewpoints. The site is not considered appropriate for very tall landmark buildings but may accommodate up to roughly 6 storeys. Archaeological investigation (starting with desk based assessment) will be required to identify the presence and significance of as yet unknown archaeological remains across the Site. Further mitigation could include avoidance and preservation in situ, further investigation, or recording depending on the significance of any remains found. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

- 2.115 **Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, Areas of Search Assessment and Guidance: Appendix D:** Through initial building height testing, the study concludes that the site sits within several Strategic Viewpoints and is therefore relatively sensitive to additional height and mass. Generally, building heights below 19m are unlikely to have adverse impacts on the skyline, subject to further testing.
- 2.116 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are areas of the site at low risk of surface water flooding, and small areas of medium or high risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur across the whole site, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 2.117 **Further consideration of capacity:** The capacity of the site has been informed by high level evidence studies including the Heritage Impact Assessment. At this stage, the draft policy doesn't identify a specific amount of development across all land uses. Further work will be required to test and consider this ahead of the Regulation 19 Proposed Submission consultation of the Local Plan. The Councils would also support a comprehensive approach to regeneration in this area, including further exploration of whether the site could be planned for in coordination with site S/C/CLT: Clifton Road Area.

## Response to issues raised in representations

2.118 Not applicable as this site was not within the Local Plan First Proposals.

## S/C/CJ: Clifton Road Area

### New or updated evidence

2.119 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA describes the site as a previously developed site where design-based mitigation is required to ensure that the development safeguards key characteristics of Cambridge, including strategic viewpoints, Foster's Mill landmark building and the railway arrival into Cambridge, as well as the setting of the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area, Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area, Mill Road Conservation Area and Grade II Listed Building Railway Station.

2.120 Development should carefully manage building heights to limit visual intrusion and using sympathetic building materials to potentially improve the arrival into Cambridge station and the setting of the Railway Station Listed Building.

2.121 Archaeological investigation (starting with desk-based assessment) will be required to identify the presence and significance of as yet unknown archaeological remains across the Site. Further mitigation could include avoidance and preservation in situ, further investigation, or recording depending on the significance of any remains found. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

2.122 **Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, Areas of Search Assessment and Guidance: Appendix D:** Through initial building height testing, the study concludes that the site sits within several Strategic Viewpoints and is therefore relatively sensitive to additional height and mass. Generally, building heights below 19m are unlikely to have adverse impacts on the skyline whilst, within the central part of the site, an individual, finely grained development of up to 25.5m may be suitable, subject to further testing.

2.123 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are areas of the site at low, medium and high risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur across the whole site, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored

further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

**2.124 Further consideration of capacity:** The capacity of the site has been informed by high level evidence studies including the Heritage Impact Assessment. At this stage, the draft policy doesn't identify a specific amount of development across all land uses. Further work will be required to test and consider this ahead of the Regulation 19 Proposed Submission consultation of the Local Plan. The Councils would also support a comprehensive approach to regeneration in this area, including further exploration of whether the site could be planned for in coordination with site S/C/CJ: Cambridge Junction and Cambridge Leisure.

Response to issues raised in representations

**2.125 Responses to issues raised in representations include:**

- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirement added to the policy.
- General landowner/stakeholder support for the site who noted that a Delivery Strategy is being prepared. Delivery of the site was a concern raised in a different representation. Known landowner/stakeholder support and commitment to preparing a Delivery Strategy supports that the site can be delivered within the Plan period.

## **S/C/SRW: Station Road West**

### **New or updated evidence**

**2.126 Planning Permission:** On 9 April 2010, planning permission (08/0266/OUT) was granted for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Station Road area. The Masterplan allocated various blocks in the area. The reserved matters for most of the blocks have subsequently obtained planning permission and been constructed. On 2 April 2023, planning permission (21/00264/FUL) was granted approval for office space for Block F2 and an Aparthotel for Block B2.

**2.127** A redesign of the site was approved in 2024 (23/01474/FUL). Development of Block B2 will provide approximately 6,679 metres square of office (Class E(g)(i)) and research and development (Class E(g)(ii)) floorspace, and the re-provision of station car parking. Block F2 is to provide approximately 4,629

metres square office (Class E(g)(i)) and research and development (Class E(g)(ii)) floorspace. Cumulatively this equates to approximately 11,300 metres square of Class E(g)(i) and Class E(g)(ii) floorspace.

- 2.128 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA describes the site as a brownfield site partly within the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area and it is adjacent to Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area to the southwest and Mill Road Conservation Area to the north. The HIA notes that if buildings exceed the height of contemporary buildings that have been constructed to the west of the Railway Station, the site could negatively impact several Strategic Viewpoints. It is also noted that the wider area contains a landmark building, the 19<sup>th</sup> century 5-storey Foster's Mill, which is a feature of a key arrival into Cambridge. The HIA notes that the site is adjacent to the Grade II listed Railway Station Building, as well as being near ten other Grade II listed buildings, and one Grade II\* listed building, the David Parr House, and over fifty locally listed buildings.
- 2.129 The HIA states that the key issue for this site is the risk of further change to the setting of the Foster's Mill historic landmark building, the setting of the Listed Railway Station Building, impacts on the character of the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area, impacts on locally listed buildings, interruption to Strategic Viewpoints and the functionality of the railway as a key historic access route to the city. The HIA recommends implementing design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of constraining building heights to prevailing heights to limit impacts on the characteristics of Cambridge and the setting of designated and non-designated assets. The HIA also states that archaeological mitigation may be required. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 2.130 Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and analysis of the capacity of similar sites has been used to determine an indicative floorspace for this allocation. The proposed indicative capacity is consistent with the approved permissions for the site's development and our own analysis, which suggests that the identified height and density is appropriate for this location.
- 2.131 The site area for the allocation has been amended since First Proposals to reflect that this is the only remaining undeveloped plot within the 'CB1' development and that there is no need to include the wider area in this policy moving forward.

## Response to issues raised in representations

2.132 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirements have been added to the policy.

## S/C/BJH: Betjeman House, Hills Road

### New or updated evidence

2.133 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA describes the site as a brownfield site adjacent to the Botanic Gardens which is a Registered Park and Garden. The site is also located within the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area and 90 metres north of the Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area. The HIA notes that there are two historic landmark buildings within the study area, the 19<sup>th</sup> century Forster's Mill, and one Grade I Listed Building. Within the 500 metres of the study area, there is the one Grade II\* Listed Building, the Wanstead House, and there are twenty one Grade II Listed Buildings. There are also thirty eight Locally Listed Buildings.. The HIA notes that tall buildings could have a moderate risk of impact to listed buildings, strategic viewpoints, and nearby Conservation Areas. It recommends mitigation measures to limit the height of buildings to prevailing local heights, using appropriate massing and the use of appropriate materials. The HIA also recommends carrying out archaeological investigation, which will be set out in the policy. The HIA was completed after the planning permission was approved, but would be relevant if the consent was not built out and alternative planning application were to be submitted.

2.134 **Planning Permission:** On 21<sup>st</sup> March 2022, the Planning Inspectorate approved an appeal for the development of the site (reference 20/03429/FUL). At time of writing construction work on the site is underway.

2.135 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The analysis of the capacity set out in the planning permission has been used to determine an indicative floorspace for this allocation.

## Response to issues raised in representations

2.136 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact

Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. The HIA has informed the policy.

- Landowner is seeking amendments so that the allocation is for commercial uses only – The policy and policy justification acknowledge the appeal decision for the site. However the councils aspirations for the site are for a mixed use development that includes an element of residential uses. Therefore, whilst the appeal decision is a material consideration should a new application be submitted for the site in the future, the policy has not been amended given the overarching merits of a mixed use scheme in a highly sustainable location.

## S/C/OPM: Old Press/Mill Lane

### New or updated evidence

**2.137 Planning Permission:** A planning application for redevelopment to include 94 student rooms, 1,478 square metres of college offices, 1,773 square metres of teaching space, 1,004 square metres of college leisure and community space, and 363 square metres of A1/A2/A3/A4 uses was granted in March 2021 (18/1930/FUL). As of May 2024, demolition works had been completed, and construction of new buildings was nearing completion. A S73 application (22/05494/S73) and discharge of conditions application (18/1930/CONDL) are awaiting a decision, which has delayed delivery. These applications relate to the southern part of the allocation.

2.138 No planning applications have been submitted for the redevelopment of the northern part of the allocation. The councils currently understand that the site now allocated as S/C/OPM: Old Press/Mill Lane (the original northern allocation) will be brought forward during the Plan period as the University of Cambridge uses continue to relocate its other sites and, that other smaller applications are expected to be submitted for more 'discrete' areas such as boat shed/ University Centre. This phasing is in accord with the masterplan submitted and agreed under 18/1930/FUL which was submitted with the first significant application and to be applied to other applications within the site boundary of the Old Press/Mill Lane Public Realm Improvement Area (S/PRIA/OPML).

2.139 **Existing Planning Policy and Guidance:** To progress the different parts of the site and their different scales of redevelopment and refurbishment, the Old Press/Mill Lane SPD (2010) considered that the Masterplan should sub-divide the site into discrete parcels consisting of areas where development was likely to come forward at the same time. This relationship between the parcels built out and those which remain to come forward is vital in achieving good co-ordination of development and a high quality environment across the wider

area as was originally allocated by in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (adopted in July 2006), carried forward into the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 (adopted in October 2018, Site U1) and reidentified as a PR1A within this draft Local Plan.

2.140 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that significant areas of the site are situated within Flood Zone 3 (10%) and Flood Zone 2 (36%), and this risk of fluvial flooding increases further to 43% within Flood Zone 3 and 50% within Flood Zone 2 when factoring the effects of climate change (without flood defences). A small proportion of the site comprises land that has historically flooded. There are notable risks of reservoir flooding during a wet-day scenario. There is also potential for groundwater flooding to occur at below-ground level and surface level for some of the site. The site contains existing historical development within Cambridge city centre, and the area of flooding is in the west of the site adjacent to the River Cam. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a high risk of flooding, and the site-specific flood risks and opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

2.141 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The approach to the capacity for this site, which is subject to submission of detailed proposals for university related uses, was considered sound as part of the site allocation in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and there has been no material change since that would suggest that the capacity approach needs to be amended. The allocation is to provide mixed use student accommodation and faculty buildings, commercial business and service-E(a), (b) (c) (food and drink floorspace) and other ancillary facilities with capacity subject to detailed proposals for university related uses.

### Response to issues raised in representations

2.142 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording – The site has not had a HIA prepared as part of the draft Local Plan making process as it is a carried forward allocation, however mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

## S/C/NMD: New Museums, Downing Street

### New or updated evidence

- 2.143 Planning Permission: Since the adoption of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, early phases of (re)development (as set out in the masterplan) have already been completed. The David Attenborough Building (previously ARUP building), Student Services Centre, and the Refurbishment of the Old Cavendish Laboratory, Old Cavendish East, and the Rayleigh Wing. Note: the proposals for the works to the David Attenborough Building were brought forward prior to the preparation on the New Museums Site Development Framework (13/0193/FUL), these proposals focused on refurbishment and internal alterations and were completed in 2015.
- 2.144 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are notable areas at low risk of surface water flooding across the site, and small areas at medium and high risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 2.145 Further consideration of site capacity: The approach to the capacity for this site, which is subject to submission of detailed proposals for university related uses, was considered sound as part of the site allocation in both the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and the New Museums Site Development Framework SPD, and there has been no material change since that would suggest that the capacity approach needs to be amended. The allocation is to provide mixed use redevelopment /refurbishment for predominantly University uses with capacity subject to detailed proposals for university related uses.

### Response to issues raised in representations

- 2.146 Responses to issues raised in representations include:
- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording – The site has not had a HIA prepared as part of the draft Local Plan making process as it is a carried forward allocation, however mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

## Sites in the First Proposals that are not included in the Draft Local Plan

### Housing

#### S/C/R5: Camfields Resource Centre and Oil Depot, 137-139 Ditton Walk

New or updated evidence

#### Reasons why not included in the draft Local Plan

2.147 This site is not included as, although the site is allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, there is uncertainty over whether housing will be delivered on this site by 2045. An application for 12 dwellings on the Camfields Resource Centre parcel (23/04380/FUL) was refused on 9 July 2025 due the potential impact of the neighbouring oil depot and other reasons.

#### Response to issues raised in representations

**2.148** Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording – the site is no longer being proposed for allocation.

#### S/C/U3: Grange Farm, off Wilberforce Road

New or updated evidence

2.149 **Planning permissions:** The site has full planning permission (21/02052/FUL) for demolition of existing buildings and erection of college accommodation, which was approved in March 2022.

#### Reasons why not included in the draft Local Plan

2.150 The development on this site has been completed and therefore there is no need to carry forwards this allocation.

#### Response to issues raised in representations

2.151 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording – the site is completed and is no longer being proposed for allocation.

## **S/C/RM1 and Policy H/7: Fen Road**

### **New or updated evidence**

2.152 Accommodation Needs Assessment of Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Showpeople and Bargee Travellers and other caravan and houseboat dwellers (2024).

### **Reasons why not included in the draft Local Plan**

2.153 The site (40394) was submitted through the call for sites process for a development comprising 100 dwellings within a marina setting. The site was assessed as unsuitable for the development proposed. Over half of the site is in Flood Zone 3 with the remainder of the site in Flood Zone 2. The site was also considered unsuitable due to its impact on the historic environment. The site sits within a conservation area and has views into and out of two conservation areas. Development alongside the river would harm these views and the character of the conservation areas. The impact cannot be reasonably mitigated.

2.154 The site has been considered to be unavailable for its original allocation of residential moorings as the landowner has stated that residential development is required to enable the marina/ moorings to be developed.

2.155 The Accommodation Needs Assessment of Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Showpeople and Bargee Travellers and other caravan and houseboat dwellers found no specific need for more residential moorings. Therefore, it was decided not to allocate a site but instead rely on a criteria based policy to assess any sites for residential moorings that do come forward over the plan period.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

2.156 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording – the site is no longer being proposed for allocation.

## **Mixed Use**

### **S/C/M5: 82-88 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman Street**

#### New or updated evidence

2.157 No additional evidence.

#### Reasons why not included in the draft Local Plan

2.158 These sites are already in commercial usage across a range of units, across a relatively constrained site. If proposals do come forward they are capable of being considered through the planning application process.

#### Response to issues raised in representations

2.159 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - The site is no longer proposed to be allocated.
- Landowner supports the allocation. Landowner is seeking amendments to include additional land at 90 Hills Road - The site is no longer proposed to be allocated.

## **Adopted allocations not proposed to be carried forward in the draft Local Plan**

### **Housing**

2.160 The following residential allocations within the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 have been or are being built out and are sufficiently advanced that they do not need a policy framework any longer, and are therefore not proposed to be carried forward:

- R1: 295 Histon Road
- R3: City Football Ground, Milton Road
- R10: Mill Road Depot and adjoining properties, Mill Road
- R12: Ridgeons, 75 Cromwell Road
- R17: Mount Pleasant House, Mount Pleasant

2.161 The following residential allocations within the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 are not proposed to be carried forward for the reasons set out below:

- R7: The Paddocks, 347 Cherry Hinton Road – this is an active site of mixed commercial uses and in reviewing whether the allocation should be carried forward, it is considered more appropriate to retain the site for the existing uses, rather than it being redeveloped for residential uses. We also have no evidence that it will still come forward for residential uses.
- R8: 149 Cherry Hinton Road & Telephone Exchange, Coleridge Road – there is uncertainty whether this site will still come forward for residential uses by 2045.
- R14: BT telephone Exchange and car park, Long Road – there is uncertainty whether this site will still come forward site for residential uses by 2045.

## Employment

2.162 The following employment allocations within the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 are not proposed to be carried forward for the reasons set out below:

- E4: Church End Industrial Estate, Rosemary Lane – this is an existing employment site that is important to protect for employment uses, therefore we consider it should be de-allocated but be included as a protected industrial site, as set out in J/PB: Protecting existing business space.
- E5: 1 and 7-11 Hills Road – the redevelopment of this site is not considered to be deliverable and therefore the Greater Cambridge Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study (November 2020) recommends that it is de-allocated.

## Mixed Use

2.163 The following mixed use allocations within the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 have been built out, and are therefore not proposed to be carried forward:

- M3: Michael Young Centre, Purbeck Road

## Policy Areas

### Policy S/PA/CC: Cambridge City Centre

#### Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to

2.164 It is important the city centre promotes and retains those uses which help support its vitality, vibrancy and diversity, to allow it to perform its sub-regional role. Cambridge has managed to retain a vibrant, thriving city centre which has responded positively to the challenges posed by changing consumer habits. Lion Yard and Grand Arcade are important sub-regional shopping centres which have successfully evolved with the conversion of some comparison retail floorspace to alternative commercial leisure uses. These, along with the city centre's other retail, leisure, cultural and tourist attractions, help it perform a multi-functional, sub-regional role. However, the reduced demand for specific retail floorspace has required greater flexibility in the type of uses permitted.

#### How was the issue covered in the First Proposals Consultation?

2.165 A specific policy was not proposed in the First Proposals consultation.

#### Policy context update

2.166 Since the publication of the First Proposals, there have been several significant changes within the city centre. The Grafton Shopping Centre has closed and has planning consent to convert from a predominantly retail/leisure destination to a mix of life sciences (research and development), hotel and retail/leisure uses. The proposals also include public realm enhancements and connectivity improvements, opening the site up to adjoining streets.

2.167 Elsewhere in the city centre, Lion Yard and Grand Arcade shopping centres have also begun to broaden their mix of uses to include more leisure facilities, demonstrated by the recently opened Premier Inn at Lion Yard and the everyman cinema in the Grand Arcade.

2.168 This policy area is intended to support development proposals within Cambridge City Centre and would replace Policy 11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

## Summary of Main issues arising from First Proposals representations

2.169 No policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation.

## New or Updated Evidence

### Retail & Commercial Leisure

2.170 The [Greater Cambridge Retail & Leisure Study](#) (April 2025) provides an update to the Cambridge Retail & Leisure Study (2013). Since the publication of the previous Cambridge Sub-Regional Retail Study 2008, and 2013 Update, town centres have had to evolve to become more than simply a place to shop, presenting themselves as multi-purpose destinations. For many this is work in progress, and the need for a robust town centre strategy is more crucial now than ever.

2.171 The April 2025 Update provides the Council with an up-to-date and comprehensive understanding of the current health and performance of the retail and leisure offer within the existing network of town centres, sets out current and future needs for additional floorspace to the period 2040, and details robust strategic and detailed planning policy recommendations.

2.172 The April 2025 Update we set out a series of policy recommendations. Those of most significance that relate to the city centre are as follows:

- Cambridge City Centre has experienced a strong positive growth in sales density since the previous 2013 Retail Study, and the city can continue to absorb any expenditure growth and footfall generated – particularly at the levels forecast in this evidence base. Any proposals for the delivery of comparison goods retail floorspace would likely be closely linked to commercial demand and appetite for investment, and should be focused in town centre locations. There is no need to plan for accommodating any need outside of town centres.
- **Convenience goods floorspace:** Set out preferred locations and sites to meet the convenience goods need arising focusing on the network of town centres (including local and village centres), planned new centres, and Strategic Sites in the first instance. We clarify the sequential approach further below. There is no need to allocate sites outside the existing, emerging and planned network of town centres for convenience goods floorspace over the plan period. Given the extent of Strategic Sites and associated delivery phasing – in some cases beyond 2040 – this position

is unlikely to change over the plan period, but the Council may wish to keep this under review, particularly given current economic uncertainty.

- **Comparison goods floorspace:** The introduction of comparison goods floorspace within town centres should be supported. Should commercial demand for new town centre comparison goods floorspace be demonstrated, this should be supported subject to wider local plan policies. This might be a redevelopment of existing space within a Primary Shopping Area and lead to positive investment and an enhanced and consolidated retail and leisure offer. Town centre redevelopment proposals which include ground floor retail/leisure within the Primary Shopping Area (this is located within the city centre) should be encouraged subject to the wider policy framework.
- **Night-Time Economy Strategy:** The Council may wish to consider a **Night-Time Economy Strategy** focused on Cambridge City Centre. Cambridge has always had an active night-time economy, particularly given the strong student and visitor population. It forms an important part of the economy. However, it is recognised that 24-hour activities are not suitable for every part of the city, and the needs of local residents should be balanced with the economic benefits of promoting a night-time economy. The nature of many night time economy uses (e.g. late night bars, clubs, and associated uses such as takeaways and late night fast-food outlets) means that it is particularly important for a joined-up approach to the development of a strategy, including planning, licencing, culture, regeneration, cleansing services and community safety. It is advised to work closely with stakeholders such as the police, local businesses, patrons, workers and residents. Applications for new Night Time Economy Uses (6pm-6am operational) should comply with the sequential test and be directed to Cambridge City Centre in the first instance. Applications for development elsewhere in Greater Cambridge should be considered on individual merits, with consideration to amenity and safety.

## Cultural Infrastructure

2.173 The [Greater Cambridge Cultural Infrastructure Strategy](#) (April 2025) provides an important platform for a shared understanding of cultural infrastructure, its importance to the region, the current suitability of cultural infrastructure stock and key cultural infrastructure needs for the future. The strategy builds upon a significant body of work including local strategies and studies conducted into the various aspects of culture, creative workspaces, infrastructure and community life in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Perhaps of most significance and relevance to the city centre, are the significant potential

benefits investment in cultural infrastructure both public and private can bring to its urban centres. The Strategy also highlights the economic importance of the culture and creative industries to the Greater Cambridge economy which deliver significant social and cultural benefits to local communities. It therefore follows that the city centre like other centres across Greater Cambridge should encourage culture and creative industries to occupy spaces that may otherwise remain vacant, especially on upper-floor spaces. These activities would not only help reinvigorate the city centre and complement its diverse range of cultural activities but also help support local shops and businesses. These would also deliver significant social and cultural benefits to local communities.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

2.174 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### **Further information supporting draft policy approach**

2.175 The city centre serves a multi-functional role, not just for Cambridge residents but also as a major attraction for students and visitors alike. It also performs an important sub-regional function for the wider community as a centre for retail, leisure and cultural activities which attracts many tourists and act as a major source of economic activity. It is considered necessary that the new Local Plan should continue to provide planning guidance for this area to ensure it remains a vibrant and attract destination.

### **Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations**

2.176 No policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation.

### **Further work and next steps**

2.177 The [Greater Cambridge Retail & Leisure Study](#) (April 2025) was based upon data gathered in later 2019 prior to the pandemic. A further update has been commissioned which will inform later stages of the plan making process.

## Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major Change

### Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to

2.178 Areas of Major Change are extensive areas of development comprising defined and known sites collectively shaping the spatial structure of Cambridge. They require a comprehensive approach to development and renewal that recognises their dependencies between sites in order to bring forward holistic change. They also need careful integration with existing nearby communities. They embrace mixed uses and multiple functions and require significant infrastructure investment and support. The need for the policy and any revisions to any of the identified areas will be considered for the draft plan.

### How was the issue covered in the First Proposals Consultation?

2.179 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major Change](#)

2.180 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: [Strategy Topic Paper](#)

### Policy context update

2.181 National Planning Policy Framework was updated in December 2024.

2.182 In terms of specific AMC areas, there have been a number of contextual changes which are listed by individual area, as follows:

- Abbey Stadium
  - This site was originally an Opportunity Site in the First Proposals consultation document. However, since the consultation, Cambridge United re-purchased the stadium from its previous owners and in 2024 confirmed that they intended to redevelop the stadium and improve the facilities rather than relocate. While planning consent, to date has not been granted, it is considered reasonable to designate this site as an Area of Major Change.
- Beehive Centre
  - This site was originally an Opportunity Site in the First Proposals consultation document. However, since the consultation, proposals

have been submitted to transform the area into a science hub with a local centre and other uses. While planning consent, to date has not been granted, it is considered reasonable to designate this site as an Area of Major Change.

- East Barnwell
  - This is a new Area of Major Change was not included in the First Proposals consultation document, but given the potential level of change, is considered to warrant a policy.
- Station Areas West and Clifton Road
  - Since the publication of the First Proposals, much of this area has now been developed it is therefore considered reasonable to not take forward this Area of Major Change. The remaining undeveloped area of Station Road West will be taken forward as a site allocation, site ref. S/C/SRW. The Clifton Road Area will be taken forward as a site allocation, site ref. S/C/CLT and is located with the Hills Road and Regent Street Corridor Public Realm Improvement Area, area ref. S/PRIA/HRRS.
- Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area
  - Since the publication of the First Proposals, the Grafton Shopping Centre has closed and has been granted planning consent to convert from a predominantly retail/leisure destination to a mix of life sciences (research and development), hotel and retail/leisure uses.
  - The western end of the centre will also be renovated to provide an improved experience for local shoppers. New public areas, including a public roof-top square, will ensure that the retained retail provision is higher quality to ensure its long-term success and viability.
  - There remain several development opportunities around the Grafton Centre itself and close by to allow for a range of mixed use of developments. The Vue cinema closed in July 2025.
  - South of Coldham's Lane
  - Outline planning permission was approved for Offices (Use Class E(g)(i)), Research and Development (Use Class E(g)(ii)), ancillary retail & facilities (Use Classes E(a) and E(b)), car and cycle parking, landscape and public realm, infrastructure and associated works, all other matters reserved except for access on 19 September 2024 (23/04590/OUT)

## **Summary of Main issues arising from First Proposals representations**

2.183 Issues raised in the representations include:

- General support for the approach towards the identified Areas of Major Change Cambridge urban area, with some suggesting modifications to the

approach. These include the inclusion of F1 (education uses) proposed by the Education and Skills Funding Agency - Department for Education. Another comment indicated the need for the policy guidance of these areas to be informed by the impact of both existing and committed housing development.

- There was strong opposition from Fen Ditton PC regarding the offsetting of development with a country park on productive, carbon sequestering farmland. Equally, one member of the public objected to the omission in Figure 16: Map showing proposed Areas of Major Change in Cambridge urban area not displaying reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works in a similar manner to the NEC area, to provide proper context for North East Cambridge (Policy S/NEC) in terms of future land use and corresponding Green Belt cost or should exclude both until DCO approved.
- One member of the public questioned why Cambridge Local Plan Policy 18: Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change, with its important safeguards, was not being brought forward.
- Another member of the public supported Policy 18 not being taken forward.

2.184 East West Main Line Partnership's current proposal to approach Cambridge from the South is based on the opportunity for major developments throughout the Southern Fringe, contrary to Cambridge Local Plan Policy 18: Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change limiting such development.

2.185 Area specific comments are provided under individual AMC sections, below.

### **New or Updated Evidence base**

2.186 There are no specific evidence documents that inform the overarching policy area. However, developments in the individual policy areas have been progressed through masterplans and the planning application process. A summary of the updates is provided under individual policy area sections, below.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

2.187 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### **Further information supporting draft policy approach**

2.188 In these Areas of Major Change policy guidance is required so that development opportunities in these locations are progressed in a comprehensive manner, including ensuring careful integration with existing

nearby communities. It is considered that the new Local Plan should continue to provide planning guidance in the areas proposed to be carried forward from the 2018 Cambridge Local Plan and in new areas, where growth is expected in key or prominent locations around the city.

## **Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations**

2.189 The list of Areas of Major Change Policy Areas is based upon those areas that have many landowners or where significant change is expected for a range of different proposals over the course of the plan period. The policy should help ensure a coordinated and much more consistent approach is taken towards infrastructure delivery, density, activity and movement as well as their successful integration with neighbouring areas.

## **S/AMC/AS: Abbey Stadium**

### **Summary of Main issues arising from First Proposals representations**

2.190 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- There was some support for this site to be an Opportunity Area and that despite the impacts on local residents on match days, the stadium and club are popular with local residents. Comments also noted that the Plan needs to provide a solid planning policy framework to secure the future of the Club either on site.
- Some comments raised environmental and transport concerns around relocating the stadium to an alternative, edge of city, location.
- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.

### **New or Updated Evidence**

2.191 In 2022, Cambridge United re-purchased the stadium from its previous owners and in 2024 confirmed that they intended to redevelop the stadium and improve the facilities rather than relocate.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

2.192 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### **Further information supporting draft policy approach**

2.193 No further information is available at this stage.

## Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

2.194 Responses to main issues raised in representations include:

- The policy now provides a clear framework for the redevelopment of the existing stadium and identifies that improvements will be required to improve accessibility to the site.
- The policy identifies the specific heritage assets within close proximity to the site, but a Heritage Impact Assessment has not been undertaken given this is a policy area rather than an allocation.
- The policy encourages additional supporting uses and making the best use of the existing site to discourage the potential of the stadium relocating out of the city.
- The role of the stadium for community support is noted and non-match day uses are encouraged in the policy.

## S/AMC/BC: Beehive Centre

### Summary of Main issues arising from First Proposals representations

2.195 The Policy Area was supported by Railpen with Croydon PC recommending underutilised areas like The Beehive and the Grafton Centres be used for housing. Cambridgeshire County Council highlighted the site is within the St. Matthew's Primary School catchment and is a restricted site and cannot expand. The intention to 'improve... infrastructure delivery' in the Opportunity Areas could enable longer-term solutions for the school's needs, e.g., new-build and relocation as part of the holistic approach outlined. The Education and Skills Funding Agency - Department for Education states the site should allow the potential inclusion of F1 (education use). One member of the public stated any replacement uses should ensure leisure and retail amenities still exist for a growing population. Historic England noted the site is immediately adjacent to the Mill Road Conservation Area and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

### New or Updated Evidence

2.196 **Planning permission:** Since the publication of the First Proposals, an outline planning application covering this site has been submitted to transform this area into a hub for science and innovation. Details of the planning application, ref. 23/03204/OUT include the demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment of the site for a new local centre (E (a-f), F1(b-f), F2(b,d)), open space and employment (office and laboratory) floorspace (E(g)(i)(ii) to the ground floor and employment floorspace (office and laboratory) (E(g)(i)(ii) to the upper floors, along with supporting infrastructure, including pedestrian and cycle routes, vehicular access, car and cycle parking, servicing areas,

landscaping and utilities. The local centre would have a Gross Internal Area of 5,178 sqm. The planning application was called in by the Secretary of State and subject to a planning enquiry, the outcome of which has yet to be published.

- 2.197 **Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, Areas of Search Assessment and Guidance: Appendix D:** Through initial building height testing, the study concludes that the site sits within several Strategic Viewpoints and is therefore relatively sensitive to additional height and mass. Generally, building heights below 19m are unlikely to have adverse impacts on the skyline, subject to further testing.

#### Additional alternative approaches considered

- 2.198 No additional alternative approaches identified.

#### Further information supporting draft policy approach

- 2.199 No further information is available at this stage.

#### Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

- 2.200 Responses to main issues raised in representations include:
- With the potential transformation of the Beehive Centre area into a hub for science and innovation, it is important that it is integrated positively with both the adjacent Cambridge Retail Park and the surrounding neighbourhoods
  - The policy will should ensure the site's re-configuration/intensification allows for the enhancement of the area's character by enhancing the pedestrian and cycle experience and reducing congestion.
  - The policy makes clear the need for proposals within the site comply with a Council approved development and environmental strategy to guide the site's re-configuration over the short, medium and long-term.

### **S/AMC/EB East Barnwell**

#### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

- 2.201 A policy S/AMC/EB East Barnwell was not included in the First Proposals consultation document.

## New or Updated Evidence

**2.202 Landowner update:** The East Barnwell (Cambridge) Masterplan, A Framework for Change was produced, setting out a framework for future development and land use. The document is the result of a successful application for funding support from the One Public Estate program. The masterplan aims to provide the following:

- To enable the construction of many new homes in the East Barnwell area of Cambridge, at a time of high demand for the city and considerable underinvestment in housing.
- To bring together East Barnwell by creating a new heart and identify deliverable infrastructure enhancement such as new and improved community uses that will be required to support future growth and improve the lives of existing residents.
- Identify interventions that combine significant community infrastructure, homes, jobs and transport links.
- To help support new jobs in Eastern Cambridge in the construction of new housing, as well as the new community and commercial properties which will be provided.
- To improve the quality of open spaces and the connections between them, allowing increased community use.
- To encourage active travel, by improving the pedestrian and cycle links both within and from East Barnwell to surrounding areas of Cambridge.

**2.203 Planning History:** Within the policy area, planning consent has been granted on two sites in the centre of East Barnwell to provide new community facilities and 120 modern, sustainable council homes. The new development will replace 18 existing ageing flats with 48 social rented and 72 intermediate rent homes, with four of the new homes designed for people with disabilities. The plans will also create a thriving and active community centre to support those living and working in the area. This includes a new library and preschool facilities, public open spaces, new shops and/or café, parking and cycle parking. The site is currently home to the Abbey Bowls Club and the local centre on Barnwell Road, which comprises shops, apartments, and a public library. A separate planning application has been approved to relocate The Bowls Club to the Abbey Leisure Complex with the creation of a new green and pavilion, along with an expanded multi-use games area. Part of the site with planning permission falls within site S/C/BRN: Land at Barnwell Road and Newmarket Road.

## Additional alternative approaches considered

2.204 No additional alternative approaches identified.

## Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

2.205 No policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation.

## S/AMC/FBG Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

2.206 This Policy Area was supported with Croydon PC recommending underutilised areas like The Beehive and the Grafton Centres be used for housing. Historic England noted the area was within the Kite conservation area and there were several listed buildings in this area. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

### New or Updated Evidence

2.207 **Planning permission:** Since the publication of the First Proposals, the Grafton Shopping Centre has gained planning consent to convert from a predominantly retail/leisure destination to a mix of life sciences (research and development), hotel and retail/leisure uses. The proposals also include public realm enhancements and connectivity improvements, opening the site up to adjoining streets.

2.208 **Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, Areas of Search Assessment and Guidance: Appendix D:** Through initial building height testing, the study concludes that the site sits within several Strategic Viewpoints and is therefore relatively sensitive to additional height and mass. Generally, building heights below 19m are unlikely to have adverse impacts on the skyline, subject to further testing.

## Additional alternative approaches considered

2.209 No additional alternative approaches identified.

## Further information supporting draft policy approach

2.210 There is currently no further information available.

## Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

2.211 The shopping centre now has planning permission for a mix of life sciences (research and development), hotel and retail/leisure uses. Development is expected deliver the new hotel adjacent to East Road with the remainder of the project to involve the conversion of the existing shopping centre into laboratory space with shops on the ground floor. The policy supports an urban design led approach to future development which should include townscape analysis and any relevant heritage assets along with the wider historic environment.

## S/AMC/SCL South of Coldham's Lane

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

**2.212** Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.

### New or Updated Evidence

2.213 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** to understand the impacts of development on the historic environment, including specific assets and their setting. The HIA notes that this is a greenfield site, which has no designated heritage assets. It also states that there is Grade I Listed Building- the church of St Andrew, four Grade II Listed Buildings, including three 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> century houses and the churchyard wall of St Andrews, within 500 metres of the site. There are also 8 Locally Listed Buildings within 500 metres of the site, and these buildings mainly comprise 19<sup>th</sup> century residential properties and part of St Bede's school. The HIA recommends implementing design-based mitigation, appropriate massing, and ensuring building heights are no taller than 6 storeys to ensure there aren't negative impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets or Strategic Viewpoint 7 – Little Trees Hill, Magog Down and Viewpoint 10. The HIA also notes that there is moderate potential for significant archaeology on the site and recommends investigation and potentially mitigation. Development requirements have been added into the policy.

2.214 **Planning Permission:** Outline planning permission was approved for Offices (Use Class E(g)(i)), Research and Development (Use Class E(g)(ii)), ancillary retail & facilities (Use Classes E(a) and E(b)), car and cycle parking, landscape and public realm, infrastructure and associated works, all other matters reserved except for access on 19 September 2024 (23/04590/OUT)

## Additional alternative approaches considered

2.215 No additional alternative approaches identified.

## Further information supporting draft policy approach

2.216 This 68 hectare site provides an opportunity for a development situated in a highly sustainable location that can positively contribute to the character of the surrounding area and transform an enclosed space into a publicly accessible urban country park. Due to contamination in this site, residential development is not possible.

2.217 By creating providing a masterplan to guide future development, a cohesive vision will be created for this site. Insisting that future applications support the delivery of this vision will empower the Local Planning Authority to deliver the original intention of the policy.

2.218 Taking a positive context-led approach to massing, style, height, and materials, will ensure that new development positively contributes to the wider setting, and does not negatively impact nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets, or residential neighbours. By delivering building heights which are appropriate for this location, the site will not negatively impact Strategic Viewpoints, nor will the site dominate its wider setting. Submitting transport assessments and committing to upgrading existing public transport routes in the area, will mean that the site takes advantage of its location, enabling future users to commute to it using sustainable modes of transportation. The policy will ensure that development proposals design new access routes to the urban country park, which will enable more people to use it. Delivering ecological enhancements and new wildlife habitats will mean that future development contributes to the Council's aspiration to increase biodiversity in the city. Requesting that development proposals decontaminate the site will make it safe for future users.

2.219 Completing archaeological work as part of any development proposal will preserve historical artefacts that could explain how people in the past used the land which the site is located on.

## Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

- Historic England highlighted the need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirement added to the policy.

## **Policy S/PRIA: Public Realm Improvement Areas (PRIA) in Cambridge**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

2.220 Public Realm Improvement Areas (PRIA) provide opportunities to enable development that can reinforce and create character and identity in key corridors and centres of the city, often through associated public realm improvements. PRIAs embrace mixed uses and multiple functions, which provides opportunities and challenges, and requires a policy framework to promote and guide overall change during the life of the plan.

### **How was the issue covered in the First Proposals Consultation?**

2.221 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [Policy S/OA: Opportunity Areas in Cambridge](#)

2.222 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: [Strategy Topic Paper](#)

### **Policy context update**

2.223 Opportunity Areas, in the current Cambridge Local Plan (2018) indicate areas in key corridors and centres of the city where there are opportunities to enhance and reinforce local identity as well as create character, often through associated public realm improvements. However, the term Opportunity Area on its own can be misconstrued and interpreted as areas where new development opportunities are encouraged. In order to clarify these designations, we are proposing to rename these areas as Public Realm Improvement Areas (PRIA) to be clear that these are areas where development is expected to take advantage of and contribute towards opportunities to improve the surrounding public realm including transport connectivity. The policy area Shire Hall/Castle Park (S/OA/CH) has not carried over into this draft version.

### **Summary of Main issues arising from First Proposals representations**

2.224 Issues raised in the representations include:

- General support for the approach towards the identified Opportunity Areas in Cambridge. Those who supported included Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC, Cambridgeshire County Council, Croydon PC and Cambridge Past, Present & Future.
- The policy was also supported along with public realm improvements by Trinity Hall, Jesus College and Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen.
- One member of the public also suggested these sites include passivhaus housing, more green spaces and smaller shops.
- Histon & Impington PC questioned the evidence to support the Plan's claim that there is already sufficient land assigned for job creation is in the correct place. They noted the business park to the North of Waterbeach on the A10 is still only partially occupied several years after it was opened: many businesses consider the location that far out of Cambridge to be unacceptable. One member of the public objected to the omission in Figure 17: Map of proposed opportunity areas in Cambridge urban area not displaying reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works in a similar manner to the NEC area, to provide proper context for North East Cambridge (Policy S/NEC) in terms of future land use and corresponding Green Belt cost or should exclude both until DCO approved.
- Jesus College indicated Land to the North of Station Road, Cambridge is also a potential allocation for employment in the Local Plan.

2.225 Area specific comments are provided in the respective section of each individual PRIA.

## **New or Updated Evidence base**

**2.226** In terms of specific areas, there have been a number of changes, and these are outlined in the respective section of each individual PRIA:

- **S/PRIA/CRP: Cambridge Retail Park** (formerly named S/OA/NR Newmarket Road)
  - Proposals for the Cambridge Retail Park are also being developed. These should enhance, consolidate and modernise existing retail units and the introduction of a more space-efficient parking strategy. A new five-storey office building at 230 Newmarket Road will serve as a key gateway to the city centre.
- **S/PRIA/EG: Eastern Gate**
  - In recent years there has been substantial development around Elizabeth Way roundabout some of which is linked to ARU and along Newmarket Road's southern flank including residential units and new

hotels around the junction with Coldham's Lane. While there are fewer opportunities for infill development in this area, it remains a very important connection between the city centre and Newmarket Road; itself a vital connection with two important areas the Beehive Centre Area of Major Change and Cambridge Retail Park Public Realm Improvement Area.

- **S/PRIA/HRRS: Hills Road and Regent Street Corridor**
  - This area was originally referenced under S/OA/Policy 25: Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre, in the First Proposals consultation document. The boundary has been amended with the inclusion of The Clifton Road Area, site ref. S/C/CLT.
- **S/PRIA/MC: Mitcham's Corner**
  - Full planning permission has been granted at 121-123 Chesterton Road for a new 134-bedroom aparthotel.
- **S/PRIA/MR: Mill Road**
  - Full planning permission has been granted for 10,219 square metres of offices, 70 build-to-rent flats, a series of residential former railway cottages and a cluster of shops set around a 1.55-acre public park. A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) has been implemented to close Mill Road bridge to all vehicles, except buses, bicycles, emergency services, taxis, and blue badge holders.
- **S/PRIA/OPML: Old Press/Mill Lane**
  - The policy area's boundary has been aligned with that of the Council approved masterplan submitted with application 18/1930/FUL.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

2.227 No additional alternative approaches identified.

## **Further information supporting draft policy approach**

2.228 In these Public Realm Improvement Areas policy guidance is required so that development opportunities in these locations are progressed in a comprehensive manner, including their public realm improvements. It is considered that the new Local Plan should continue to provide planning guidance in the areas proposed to be carried forward from the 2018 Cambridge Local Plan and in new areas, where growth is expected in key or prominent locations around the city.

## **Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations**

2.229 Responses to main issues raised in representations include:

- The policy provides a clear requirement for co-ordinated public realm improvements in these areas as part of the policy's 'place-making' objective.
- The policy encourages a range of uses that support or deliver local shops and services.
- The policy also requires site promoters to develop a policy framework to resolve challenges that can arise with complex development opportunities, to guide the re-configuration of these sites.
- The allocation of employment sites is separate to this policy.

## **S/PRIA/CRP Cambridge Retail Park**

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

2.230 This Policy Area was supported by Railpen with Croydon PC recommending underutilised areas like The Beehive and the Grafton Centres be used for housing. Cambridgeshire County Council highlighted the site is within the St. Matthew's Primary School catchment and is a restricted site and cannot expand. The intention to 'improve... infrastructure delivery' in the OAs could enable longer-term solutions for the school's needs, e.g., new-build and relocation as part of the holistic approach outlined. The Education and Skills Funding Agency - Department for Education states the site should allow the potential inclusion of F1 (education use). One member of the public stated any replacement uses should ensure leisure and retail amenities still exist for a growing population. Cambridge Past, Present & Future stated Land at Cheddars Lane should be included in the Opportunity Area. Historic England noted the proximity of several designated heritage assets and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

2.231 Fen Ditton PC noted Newmarket Road retail and Beehive areas both fulfil an important function for residents and questioned why the Tesco site had been excluded. The sites' accesses should also be investigated due to road congestion. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties agreed that Newmarket Road Retail Park and the Beehive Centre are not the best use of this land. The retail park model places great emphasis on access by car, disadvantages small independent businesses, and contributes to the decline of high streets. They supported redevelopment of these areas to meet identified needs.

### New or Updated Evidence

2.232 Developer information: The site developers are preparing a strategic framework to provide a structure for the long-term evolution of Cambridge Retail Park (CRP) into a sustainable and vibrant retail park for Cambridge. It

will serve as a steering document to inform the strategic development of CRP and will:

- Secure the relocation of 'valued' retailers from the Beehive.
- Ensure CRP continues to meet the future retail needs of the city and local communities.
- Support the shared goal of transforming the character of Newmarket Road by enhancing the pedestrian and cycle experience and reducing congestion.
- Introduce a thoughtful environmental strategy to improve the park's performance.
- Provide a cohesive approach to the park's evolution, ensuring it remains 'open for business' throughout.

2.233 CRP will play an important role in meeting the relocation needs of key retailers/leisure operators from Beehive Retail Park. There is currently no other location for these operators in Cambridge. Retaining those that can be relocated in one location at CRP encourages more sustainable travel patterns. It also minimises the potential for future retail/leisure warehouse park proposals in unsustainable locations further away from the City Centre (against both national and local planning policy).

2.234 **Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, Areas of Search Assessment and Guidance: Appendix D:** Through initial building height testing, the study concludes that the site sits within several Strategic Viewpoints and is therefore relatively sensitive to additional height and mass. Generally, building heights below 19m are unlikely to have adverse impacts on the skyline, subject to further testing.

#### Additional alternative approaches considered

2.235 No additional alternative approaches identified.

#### Further information supporting draft policy approach

2.236 Cambridge Retail Park (CRP) provides an essential large format retail destination with supporting food, beverage and trade offers. It is also an important amenity for the people of Cambridge. CRP provides spin off benefits to the city centre by way of linked shopping trips which encourage further visits to city centre.

## Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

2.237 Responses to main issues raised in representations include:

- With the proposed transformation of the Beehive Centre area into a hub for science and innovation, it is important that the Cambridge Retail Park is allowed to retain 'bulky' retailers from the Beehive by making much better use of the site as well as ensuring it meets the future retail needs of the city and local communities.
- The policy should ensure the site's re-configuration/intensification allows for the enhancement of Newmarket Road's character by enhancing the pedestrian and cycle experience and reducing congestion.
- The policy makes clear the need for proposals to integrate with the adjacent Beehive Centre development site and the surrounding neighbourhoods. It should also ensure development within the site complies with a Council approved development and environmental strategy framework to guide the site's re-configuration over the short, medium and long-term; this cohesive approach towards the park's evolution should ensure it remains 'open for business' throughout.
- Other sites, north of Newmarket Road have not been included as they provide important uses such as food stores which help meet the area's existing retail/food shopping needs and have no similar transformation plans.

## **S/PRIA/EG: Eastern Gate**

### Summary of Main issues arising from First Proposals representations

- Concern that the north area of St Matthew's Piece and the allotments on New Street are identified as 'opportunity areas'. as they are protected open space. Need to be removed from the classification of an 'opportunity area' and re-classified as untouchable protected open space
- Request that all the protected open space areas within the footprint of the 2018 'Eastern Gate Opportunity Area' are retained
- Policy should set maximum building heights (2+1) along New Street - the northern boundary of St Matthew's Piece
- One member of the public suggested that any prioritisation of the Newmarket Road area should focus on: Improving public transport links to these areas.
- Developer support for continuation of Eastern Gate Opportunity Area, that SPD should be updated to reflect developments built out and that the St Matthews Centre site should be identified as a site capable of delivering mixed use education and student accommodation facilities (58941/58945)
- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.

## New or Updated Evidence

- 2.238 **Context:** In recent years there has been substantial development around Elizabeth Way roundabout some of which is linked to ARU and along Newmarket Road's southern flank including residential units and new hotels around the junction with Coldham's Lane. While there are fewer opportunities for infill development in this area, it remains a very important connection between the city centre and Newmarket Road; itself a vital connection with two important Public Realm Improvement Areas, the Beehive Centre and Cambridge Retail Park. Both areas are expected to undergo significant transformation and re-configuration, respectively. In so doing, they afford the opportunity to improve connections within them and beyond including the city centre. There is also potential for development along East Road associated with ARU. For these reasons, the Eastern Gate PRIA remains an important policy area, to ensure a coordinated approach towards public realm improvements and movement strategies along with area-wider transport strategies.
- 2.239 **Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment for site 59405,** was submitted during the first Proposals consultation in November and December 2021 for St Matthews Centre, Sturton Street Site. This proposed mixed-use development comprising 80-82 units of student accommodation, specialist educational use and public open space. This site was confirmed unsuitable for development due to the historic environment of mature trees and open character of the site provide strong contribution to Mill Road Conservation Area; regarded as a key open and public space. The current built form on site has low impact on the significance of the area due to use, scale, and detailing and redevelopment of the site would harm the character of the conservation area.
- 2.240 **Planning Permissions:** 18/1679/FUL 212-214 Newmarket Rd- Mixed use development for ground floor commercial space (Use Classes A1, A2, B1 and D1) with 13 dwellings. The developer anticipates that the development will be completed in June/July 2025 (see Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Housing Land Supply Report 2025). 23/02685: 23/02685/FUL- Demolition of 11-12 Burleigh Street and Abbeygate House, and part demolition and alterations to the Grafton Centre, removal of existing facades, erection of new floorspace for life science use, new and replacement façades and shopfronts.

## Additional alternative approaches considered

- 2.241 No additional alternative approaches identified.

## Further information supporting draft policy approach

2.242 Key projects which were included in the Eastern Gate Area Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2011 are no longer included within the policy. This is either due to their inclusion within the projects of the GCP Cambridge Eastern Access Improvement Scheme or because the principle of projects have been included within wider Draft Greater Cambridge Shared Local Plan policies (including by the overarching PRIA policy which requires development in the Eastern gate PRIA to take account of any relevant public realm and, or transport improvement strategies).

## Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

2.243 Responses to main issues raised in representations include:

- The policy area is now a designated Public Realm Improvement Area and not an 'Opportunity Area'; this means new development within these areas should contribute to the improvement of the area's character and connectivity, not just internally but also with surrounding neighbourhoods and other Areas of Major Change and Public Realm Improvement Areas.
- Development proposals involving the loss of protected open space would normally only be granted if they comply with the relevant policy to safeguard such spaces.
- With the number of new developments in the area and especially with proposals at the Beehive Centre and Grafton Centre, an urban design led approach is taken, including townscape analysis and character appraisals to evidence appropriate scale and massing of development proposals in the policy area.

## **S/PRIA/HRRS: Hills Road and Regent Street Corridor**

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

2.244 This policy approach was supported by Trinity Hall, Jesus College and Pace Investments. Historic England noted the site includes parts of the Central and New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Areas and is adjacent to the Botanic Gardens and Emmanuel College. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

### New or Updated Evidence

2.245 The Greater Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study (April 2025) identified Hills Road and Hills Road/Cherry Hinton Road are of sufficient scale to move from

a Local Centre to a District Centre. Their evolution to becoming a District Centre is proposed in Policy J/RC: Retail & Centres.

### Additional alternative approaches considered

2.246 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### Further information supporting draft policy approach

2.247 At the time of drafting there remained a number of empty office buildings along Hills Road, passed Station Road towards the city centre, however much of the development around the main railway station is now complete.

2.248 On the corner of Station Road and Hills Road, potential proposals include the redevelopment of Kett House with a much taller building. Opposite, at Botanic Place, construction has begun with the development of new office space along with a new public house that retains the historic façade, including the former lounge and bar area of the former Flying Pig PH and will be relaunched as a public house.

### Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

2.249 Responses to main issues raised in representations include:

- The policy area is now a designated Public Realm Improvement Area and not an 'Opportunity Area'; this means new development within these areas should contribute to the improvement of the area's character, this would include avoiding any potential impact on local heritage assets guided by policies in the draft local plan.

## **S/PRIA/MC: Mitcham's Corner**

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

2.250 Historic England noted Mitcham's Corner (S/OA/Policy 22) included parts of the Central and Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Areas. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

### New or Updated Evidence

2.251 **Planning Permissions:** Full planning permission has been granted at 121-123 Chesterton Road for a new 134-bedroom aparthotel, arranged over four storeys and features a gym and business centre. The development also

includes a retail unit on the ground floor and aims to achieve high sustainability targets.

### Additional alternative approaches considered

2.252 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### Further information supporting draft policy approach

2.253 In 2024, the Greater Cambridge Partnership completed works at Mitcham's Corner as part of their Milton Road improvement scheme. The project included new footways, cycleways and pedestrian crossings along with new cycle parking to make it safer and easier for people to access shops and businesses at Mitcham's Corner.

### Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

2.254 Responses to main issues raised in representations include:

- The policy area is now a designated Public Realm Improvement Area and not an 'Opportunity Area'; this means new development within these areas should contribute to the improvement of the area's character, this would include avoiding any potential impact on local heritage assets guided by policies in the draft local plan.

## **S/PRIA/MR: Mill Road**

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

2.255 Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen supported the proposed retention of Mill Road Opportunity Area, Mill Road (S/OA/Policy 24) including the Travis Perkins site on Devonshire Road. The policy should however explicitly attach positive weight to development that helps to meet aims of the Opportunity Area policy. Historic England noted the site includes parts of the Mill Road, Kite and Glisson Road Conservation Areas. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

### New or Updated Evidence

2.256 Full planning permission has been granted for The Mill Yard project, formerly known as Devonshire Gardens and is now under-construction. It a brownfield regeneration project and comprises 10,219 square metres of offices, 70 build-

to-rent flats, a series of residential former railway cottages and a cluster of shops across seven buildings set around a 1.55-acre public park.

### Additional alternative approaches considered

2.257 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### Further information supporting draft policy approach

**2.258** In October 2024, Cambridgeshire County Council approved a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to close Mill Road bridge to all vehicles, except buses, bicycles, emergency services, taxis, and blue badge holders. It will be implemented as a bus gate.

### Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

2.259 Responses to main issues raised in representations include:

- The policy clearly supports proposals which provide sustainable forms of transport and co-ordinated public realm improvements, to help develop local 'place-making' along with proposals that support for local shops and services
- The policy area is now a designated Public Realm Improvement Area and not an 'Opportunity Area'; this means new development within these areas should contribute to the improvement of the area's character, this would include avoiding any potential impact on local heritage assets guided by policies in the draft local plan.

## S/PRIA/OPML: Old Press/Mill Lane

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

2.260 The University of Cambridge questioned why the Old Press Mill Lane site was designation as an Opportunity Area under Old Press/Mill Lane (S/OA/Policy 26) and as a site allocation. Historic England noted the many listed buildings on site and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

### New or Updated Evidence

2.261 The planning application 18/1930/FUL has now been implemented leaving the north site undeveloped, site reference S/C/OPM. The policy area's boundary has been aligned with that of the Council approved masterplan

submitted with application 18/1930/FUL. The boundary covers the whole area including the developed southern site because the masterplan considers wayfinding, access, public realm, active uses between all land parcels in line with and covering the aspirations of original 2010 SPD.

### Additional alternative approaches considered

2.262 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### Further information supporting draft policy approach

2.263 The development of the site should create high quality streets, spaces and buildings. As the future development on the site will be achieved through a combination of the adaptive reuse of existing buildings as well as through new development, the success of any scheme will be based on the sympathetic integration of any new and existing buildings

### Response to Main issues raised in representations

2.264 Given the sensitivity of the site's location, in terms of both historic buildings and quintessential riverside setting besides/close to the River Cam, it is important that the remaining undeveloped site takes account of the approved masterplan for the wider area; which itself was informed by the many constraints and considerations listed in the Old Press/Mill Lane Supplementary Planning Document.

### Further work and next steps

2.265 The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service has commissioned a new Greater Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study, to update the April 2025 version. This will support the review of the joint Local Plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The 2025 study will comprise of two sections. The first will provide an updated baseline report to provide a review of current retail and leisure provision in Greater Cambridge. The household and in-centre surveys completed to inform the previous study (January 2025) were completed in Oct 2019, before any Covid lockdowns. The second section, using the baseline information, collected in April 2025 will inform the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. It will include the identification of retail and leisure needs including the needs of strategic developments and outline the revised hierarchy of centres for Greater Cambridge.

## 3. Edge of Cambridge

3.1 This chapter provides a background summary of the evidence and representations received from earlier stages of consultation on the sites within the Edge of Cambridge.

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

3.2 Issues raised in the representations include:

#### **Proposed approach to development on the edge of Cambridge:**

- General support for development on the edge of Cambridge.
- Encroachment into the Green Belt should be minimal taking account of the purposes of the Green Belt.
- Setting of Cambridge needs to be considered and preserved.
- Needs to include provision of education and health services and facilities that are delivered in a timely manner and connected to the community,
- Site allocations need to include clear requirements for well-designed places that promote healthy lifestyles, including provision of open spaces, good access to sustainable modes of transport and taking account of the lessons learnt from the pandemic,
- Needs to include truly affordable housing,
- Concerns about over development on eastern edge of Cambridge,
- Focus on large sites could lead to problems with infrastructure provision, viability and housing delivery, and
- Concerns about effects on traffic congestion, particularly impacts on those travelling into Cambridge from the villages.
- Not enough sites allocated to meet long term demand and given its unsustainability – there are more sites that could be allocated, and a number of new sites suggested.
- Need a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge, as high reliance on infrastructure delivery.

#### **Rejected sites:**

- Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

3.3 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement.

## Response to issues raised in representations

3.4 Representations supporting the approach set out in the First Proposals are noted. Some representors considered no further development should take place in the Green Belt, others, including arrange of site promoters, considered not enough sites had been identified. These issues are addressed in the strategy topic paper. Comments highlighted the need for development to be supported by infrastructure, affordable housing and open spaces. The draft plan is accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and policies would require developed to contribute appropriately to meeting infrastructure needs.

## Policy S/CE: Cambridge East

### Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to

3.5 Provide policy guidance for future development of land at Cambridge East – both the safeguarded land in the 2018 Local Plans and the adopted allocations for Marleigh and Springstead Village.

### How was the issue covered in the First Proposals Consultation?

3.6 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [Policy S/CE: Cambridge East](#)

3.7 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: Development [Strategy Topic Paper \(2021\)](#)

## Policy context update

3.8 National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2024, including changes to Green Belt policy.

3.9 Marshall announced (in October 2025) that the business will not be moving to the Cranfield site but the company is still committed to moving its aerospace business from its Cambridge Airport base by 2030; this will unlock the site for development which is anticipated to start in 2032.

## Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

3.10 There was general support for the development at Cambridge East, particularly the relocation of the airport to allow for the delivery of a mixed-use site, providing open spaces, housing (including affordable housing), employment, retail, and cultural facilities with high quality and comprehensive

transport networks. Supporters of the proposed policy direction included: Huntingdonshire DC, Cambridge Past, Present & Future, National Trust, Anglian Water Services Ltd, Marshall Group Properties, and some individuals. There was encouragement for transport improvements on already congested access routes, provision of public transport to improve connectivity, and support for separate designated cycle and walking infrastructure.

- 3.11 There was some concern for the relocation of the current airfield, particularly the uncertainty of timing of the relocation of airport and related uses, unforeseen delays in relocation affecting the delivery of housing within the plan period (including affordable housing), reliance on the GCP Cambridge Eastern Access scheme, and deliverability and viability development risks leaving the plan vulnerable at examination stage. Campaign to Protect Rural England were concerned with the loss of existing jobs on the site, with a large number of representations to question 3 also raising concern for the displacement of a skilled workforce and engineering jobs that had been part of the airport for decades.
- 3.12 Some comments including those from Historic England, Save Honey Hill, Cambridge Past, Present and Future, Parish Councils, and individuals were in opposition to the development as they thought the character and landscape of the surrounding areas should be retained with likely pressures on areas including Teversham village, the Green Belt land, Eastern Fens and Fen Ditton. This was also reflected in the responses to question 3 of the questionnaire.
- 3.13 In addition to these representations, question 3 of the questionnaire was also related to the provision of housing, jobs, facilities and open spaces at Cambridge East. Many responses voiced concerns for impacts on water supply and aquifers at high demand. Other responses raised concerns for the provision of biodiversity and green spaces through a range of landscaping of all scales.
- 3.14 Additionally, comments on question 3 thought that the development should be built with a range of well-designed and climate friendly homes (including affordable housing) to accommodate families with provision of a range of job opportunities, retail and leisure facilities within a 15-minute radius to support the local community without having to travel elsewhere. These responses also supported the need for design of safe, and cohesive communities that support the mental health and wellbeing of people living there.
- 3.15** Although responses to the policy were generally in support of improvements to existing road infrastructure and provision of public transport, cycle and

walking infrastructure, a high number of responses to question 3 were concerned for impacts on infrastructure from development at Cambridge East. Some comments suggested that congestion will be increased even with improvements due to reliance on cars to travel into town by older people and disadvantaged groups and expressed the need for parking on-site for people who need a car. However, most responses to question 3 were in support of creating a car-free development and the provision of zero carbon transport options, with separate cycling and walking infrastructure. Lastly, some comments suggested the provision of a light railway, metro or underground as an alternative to bus use.

## New or Updated Evidence base

3.16 Planning Permission: 2.10 Planning Permissions: Several planning permission have been granted within the Cambridge East area since consultation on the First Proposals. These include:

- **Marleigh** – outline planning permission for the demolition of buildings and hard standing and the construction of sports facilities, open space and supporting infrastructure (13/1837/OUT) was granted in 2016, with reserved matters application (18/0459/REM) for infrastructure works granted in 2018. Outline planning permission for Marleigh was granted in November 2016 for up to 1,300 homes, a primary school, a food store, and community facilities Marleigh: Building work on Phase 1 started in November 2019;
  - Phase 2 reserve matters application for 421 dwellings (21/02450/REM) was approved in November 2021;
  - Phase 3a – reserved matters application for 332 homes and commercial space (23/04930/REM) was approved in July 2025;
  - Phase 3b – a full planning application for an additional 91 homes (23/04936/FUL) was approved in July 2025.
- **Springstead Village** – outline planning permission for a maximum 1,200 homes, retirement living facility, local centre, primary and secondary schools, community facilities, open spaces and allotments (18/0481/OUT & S/1231/18/OL) was granted in December 2020:
  - Reserved matters applications (22/03137/REM & 22/03140/REM) for Phase 1 were approved in April 2023;
  - Phase 2 reserved matters applications (22/04102/REM & 22/04037/REM) were approved in November 2022;
  - Phase 3 reserved matters applications (22/05018/REM and 22/05037/REM) were approved in April 2023;
  - The Phase 4 reserved matters application (23/03347/REM) was approved in April 2024.

3.17 Central Bedfordshire Council resolved to grant outline planning permission (CB/22/04299/OUT) for the relocation of Marshall Aerospace to a new facility at Cranfield University on 19 April 2023. However, Marshall announced (in October 2025) that the business will not be moving to the Cranfield site but the company is still committed to moving its aerospace business from its Cambridge Airport base by 2030; this will unlock the site for development which is anticipated to start in 2032.

## Evidence produced by the Councils

3.18 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) 2025:** In summary, the key heritage sensitivities for the site include:

- Designated heritage assets on site including the Terminal Grade II\* Listed Building and associated curtilage listed hangar, and possible curtilage listed Hotel and boundary walls on the landside of the Terminal.
- Setting of designated heritage assets on site, specifically the immediate setting of the Terminal Building and associated buildings and structures, both landside and airside.
- Non-designated heritage assets on site including a group of Second World War airport hangars and buildings whose loss would have to be considered in line with planning policy.
- The setting of Teversham Conservation Area and the All Saints Church Grade II\* Listed Building, in particular the setting of these assets in the identified key views from the junction of Airport Way and along Church Road, and from the churchyard of All Saints Church.
- The skyline of Cambridge as perceived in Strategic fixed and dynamic views, in particular those in which buildings on the site can already be seen (Castle Mound, Limepit Hill, and Shelford Road/Worts' Causeway).

3.19 **Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, Areas of Search Assessment and Guidance: Appendix D:** Through initial building height testing, the study concludes that the site sits within several Strategic Viewpoints. Some parts of the site are more sensitive to height and mass than others, and therefore the design of the site will need to be carefully considered through a design led approach. Buildings up to 32m may be appropriate in specific locations but further testing is required through the planning application process.

3.20 **Cambridge East Landscape Study (2025):** Drawing on the Greater Cambridge Landscape Study, the Cambridge East Landscape Study identified the landscape character and sensitivities, considered the potential landscape

capacity of the site to accommodate development, and tested options for the extent, character and function of the Strategic Green Corridor running through the site.

3.21 **Building heights:** The report recommends the height and massing of buildings at Cambridge East should be tested by more detailed landscape and visual impact assessment work at the pre-application/application stage in relation to key views and approaches to the Site to ensure development is not prominent on the skyline and detrimental to the rural character of the wider LCA 6A Fen Ditton Fen Edge Chalklands (medium sensitivity) and LCA 1E Fulbourn Fen (medium to high sensitivity) landscapes beyond the Site.

3.22 **Green Belt corridor:** The report notes the existing green corridors in Cambridge vary in scale, width and characteristics along their length in response to adjacent urban land uses. It proposes six Principles for the planning and design of the Cambridge East Strategic Green Corridor and two scenarios were tested (scenario 1 narrowing and widening and scenario 2 widening the existing green belt corridor) against these principles. The report suggests other evidence may also need to be considered in developing a preferred approach to the spatial extent/shape of the strategic green corridor with regards to defining the developable area for Cambridge East. These include in particular:

- Impacts on the purpose and functions of the Green Belt corridor through the Site
- Impacts on the City's townscape/historic core, skyline and key strategic viewpoints
- Impacts on the setting of the Teversham Conservation Area

3.23 **Green edges:** The report notes that opportunities should be considered to create a green edge that provides a "buffer" to help integrate built development into the landscape setting. This could include securing land to the east of Airport Way for off-site landscape mitigation to achieve effective integration and screening of buildings. To maximise the benefits of a 'green edge' to development along the Site's eastern boundary, the green corridor should prioritise integration of the development edge into the countryside setting (including screening of development in views from Teversham).

3.24 **Greater Cambridge Local Plan employment evidence:** The [Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study: Life science and ICT locational, land and accommodation needs](#) identifies that Cambridge East – as a well connected large scale urban quarter - is well located and of a scale to be successful as a new location for office, dry lab, and potentially wet labs. The [Greater Cambridge Industrial and Warehousing Sector Study 2025](#) identifies a significant shortfall in industrial and warehousing space, and that Cambridge

East is well placed to meet a proportion of that need- particularly for the general industrial and midtech sub-sectors.

- 3.25 **New Strategic Allocations Assessment: Transport Mitigation Measures (WSP, September 2025):** In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, transport mitigation requirements have been identified for Cambridge East that support safe and suitable access for all users, that ensure sustainable modes are prioritised and that the design of internal streets reflects the National Design Guide. This document draws on Greater Cambridge wide transport modelling, and also on the Transport Topic Papers summarised below.
- 3.26 **Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers (2025):** The Accommodation Needs Assessment (ANA) of Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Showpeople, Bargee Travellers, and other caravan and houseboat dwellers for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (September 2024) makes a series of recommendations for meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Greater Cambridge. Each of the recommendations in terms of potential sources of supply have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Greater Cambridge. It includes recommendations for new Gypsy and Traveller sites to be provided at existing and new strategic sites.
- 3.27 **Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10c: Design of Gypsy and Traveller Sites (2025):** The Councils are proposing that strategic sites, such as new settlements and urban extensions, include sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. To inform the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within these strategic sites, it is necessary to consider: what is an appropriate number of pitches for each strategic site, and the amount of land required for different sizes of Gypsy and Traveller sites. This report sets out recommendations for the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites, based on the evidence collated, and is used to inform the anticipated delivery of Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites in Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers.
- 3.28 **Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 11: Meeting the specialist housing needs of older people and those with disabilities (2025):** Potential sources of supply to meet the identified accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities, taking account of the development strategy, have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential

source of supply will contribute towards meeting the specialist accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities. It includes recommendations for a proportion of new homes at existing and new strategic sites to be provided as specialist accommodation, particularly for older people or those with disabilities.

- 3.29 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that large areas of the site have planning permission and construction of the approved development has commenced. The site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are areas of low, medium and high surface water flood risk within the site. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with some areas of the site being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level and at surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. There is an unmapped ordinary watercourse running through or adjacent to the site. Given the size of the site, it is likely that built development can be situated outside of areas of high flood risk using a sequential approach to the site's design. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

### **Additional submissions by the site promoter**

- 3.30 The site promoter has developed further evidence to demonstrate the deliverability of the Cambridge East site, and to respond to the issues identified in the First Proposals. These have not been endorsed by the Councils or other public body unless stated otherwise. As such they form further background information that provides context to the draft policy.
- 3.31 Landscape and Visual Capacity Appraisal (2022): A high-level appraisal to understand, define and record the context, character, setting and sensitivity of the Site in order to consider its capacity and that of the surrounding landscape and visual resource to accommodate the nature of development proposed. This report provides a series of recommendations to inform development of a landscape led masterplan for the Safeguarded Site that is likely to be acceptable in landscape and visual terms.
- 3.32 Summary of the Constraints Evidence Base: Cambridge East (August 2023)** This document, together with the suite of technical studies / assessments appended to it, has been prepared to report the findings of the

technical evidence base work that Marshall and its consultant team has been preparing in relation to the development of Cambridge East. The purpose of this document is to summarise the work that has been undertaken to date and outline the main site constraints that have been identified. N.B. This document captures a point in time and is not wholly up-to-date; for example it makes reference to the Waste Water Treatment Plant and draft Water Resource Management Plans, which have moved on in the intervening period.

- 3.33 **Cambridge East Initial Engagement (October 2023):** Provides a record of initial community engagement by Marshall on early ideas and the opportunity for future development at Cambridge East between June and August 2023.
- 3.34 **Cambridge East – Delivery Rates (January 2025):** Supplements information submitted in December 2020 as part of a capacity testing exercise, to confirm delivery rates for Cambridge East in order to inform the emerging Local Plan.
- 3.35 **Cambridge East Site Capacity Considerations (May 2025):** Additional evidence, to supplement evidence submitted in December 2020 and July 2021, to demonstrate that the Cambridge East site is capable of accommodating a greater scale of development than the 7,000 homes and 9,000 jobs Councils included within the First Proposals consultation 2021.
- 3.36 **Transport Topic Papers (Stantec, December 2022):** The site promoter prepared Transport topic papers 1 to 5 to explore different topics which have a transport implication. These have been reviewed and endorsed by Cambridgeshire County Council - the Local Highway Authority. The aim of topic papers is to set out succinctly the variations, different considerations, and resulting implications of different approaches within that specific topic:
- Topic Paper 1 Proposed Structuring Principles: addresses guiding principles for the development, including provision of connected 5-minute neighbourhoods contributing to a 15-minute City, points of access, and design principles of the high frequency public transport route.
  - Topic Paper 2 Trip Budget: outlines the role of a trip budget, the stages of defining a trip budget, what needs to be considered when setting a trip budget, identifies an early trip budget for Cambridge East (1,500 vehicular trips in the AM peak and 1,800 trips in the PM peak) and outlines the next steps in terms of exploring an optimum level of development that delivers a credible and defensible car mode share, and contextualising the mode share of external trips.
  - Topic Paper 3 Homes Jobs Ratio: addresses how the mix of homes and jobs influence travel patterns, how the mix can benefit sustainability, the interface between development mix and trip budget, and the performance of different development mixes at Cambridge

East. It identifies that the overall quantum of development has a more significant impact on performance compared to the mixes of jobs and homes. Higher levels of development result in higher internalisation and shorter trips but this must be balanced with higher external trip generation. Within the ranges of jobs and homes ratios of 0.5 – 1.0 there are minor differences in performance and no mix results in favourable outcomes across all time periods.

- Topic Paper 4 Low Car Living and Mode Share Precedents: explores the meaning of low car living and the benefits associated with it, successful precedents from elsewhere in Cambridge, the UK and Europe, and low car living in the context of Cambridge East.
- Topic Paper 5 Transport Scenarios and Delivery: tests two development mix scenarios (7,000 homes and 9,000 jobs, and 9,500 homes and 9,000 jobs) and provides a summary of the key transport mitigation associated with the scenarios.

**3.37 Cambridge East Transport Approach (March 2025):** Provides a high-level update on the transport approach in the context of changing circumstances nationally and locally, to demonstrate that Cambridge East remains deliverable in transport terms.

### Further information supporting draft policy approach

**3.38** Land was released from the Green Belt and safeguarded in previous plans for the development of a major new urban extension at Cambridge East. Policy guidance is required to ensure the comprehensive development of the whole area that is now anticipated to become available for development, including land at Marleigh and Springstead Village, where delivery has not been constrained by the operational airport.

**3.39** Policy guidance is required to ensure that development opportunities and challenges are identified and responded to, to make best use of this sustainable strategic site on the edge of Cambridge, and ensure development is progressed in a comprehensive manner, including ensuring careful integration with existing nearby communities. The new policy will ensure a comprehensive approach to development at this new urban quarter.

### Context

**3.40** The site promoter proposed a larger site, including additional land to the east of Airport Way which lies within the Cambridge Green Belt. The Greater Cambridge Green Belt Study 2021 considers if these land parcels were to be released it would result in high or very high harm to the Green Belt. The development strategy has identified alternative locations to meet development needs, including the significant supply of land available through the safeguarded land. Having weighed up the scale of our needs for development

in relation to existing supply, and the opportunities and challenges of edge of Cambridge Green Belt locations alongside opportunities for development beyond the Green Belt, the Councils conclude that our general development needs alone do not provide the 'exceptional circumstances' required in national policy to justify removing land from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in this Local Plan. Notwithstanding, were the larger site to be allocated the Councils consider that it would not substantively increase housing delivery within the current plan period. It is not considered that there are exceptional circumstances for further Green Belt release in this location.

## **Built Form**

- 3.41 Cambridge East should achieve a density of development that supports liveability in a compact, walkable, and sustainable urban form that promotes active travel and public transport use. This needs to be balanced with the need to respect and enhance the local landscape, townscape and heritage, informed by the Landscape Study, and Heritage Impact Assessment.
- 3.42 It should be distinctive and contemporary whilst celebrating existing heritage assets, with variation in building form and spaces drawing on local character, to complement the wider Cambridge skyline and create a well-considered eastern approach to the City. This includes respecting the setting of the Grade II\* Listed Terminal building, curtilage listed assets such as the hangar and possibly the hotel and boundary walls, and non-designated heritage assets on the site as well as the nearby Teversham Conservation Area and Grade II\* Listed All Saints Church, noting the church and the skyline of Cambridge are perceived in several key views from the south of the City and from Castle Mound. The Landscape Study notes the adjoining landscape character is of medium to high sensitivity and opportunities should be taken to create a green edge that provides a "buffer" to help integrate built development into the landscape setting and the eastern approach to the site will need careful consideration.

## **Uses**

- 3.43 Cambridge East will be a vibrant and inclusive mixed-use urban quarter, with a balance of jobs and homes, a wide range of services and facilities, and incorporating a mix of open and green spaces, to support an intergenerational community in the east of the City. Alongside other key locations, Cambridge East provides an opportunity to make Cambridge a more polycentric city, being a strategic growth opportunity that can provide complementary uses to the historic city core. As such the site will integrate an appropriate mix of cultural and commercial space, including research and development, to foster economic opportunity, collaboration, and innovation complementing existing

uses in the City centre. Ahead of Proposed Submission, further exploration of the appropriate balance and mix of uses to ensure that Cambridge East serves a wider city and sub-regional function without competing with and undermining existing uses in the City centre.

- 3.44 The identified housing capacity of approximately 8,000 homes has been calculated by testing a range of assumptions regarding housing numbers and housing densities, and employment floorspace provision and floorspace densities, whilst making assumptions for the land take of accompanying green spaces, social infrastructure uses such as schools, healthcare, a range of sports and community facilities, as well as physical infrastructure such as roads.
- 3.45 Further work may be completed prior to the Proposed Submission stage to refine the proposed capacity, in particular considering any implications from the potential railway station proposed at this site (see below)
- 3.46 The policy identifies only an approximate housing figure, with the implication that the final site capacity could be higher or lower than this, noting that this and the final mix of uses will be determined through a design-led approach and preparation of an Outline planning application.
- 3.47 As identified in the New or Updated Evidence section above, the [Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study: Life science and ICT locational, land and accommodation needs](#) identifies that Cambridge East – as a well connected large scale urban quarter is well located and of a scale to be successful as a new location for office, dry lab, and potentially wet labs. The scale of the site means that this supply for these uses should keep delivering beyond the current plan period. Such uses are best located within the site close to the proposed district centre. An approximate employment floorspace figure is not identified in the policy, noting that with the high level of commitments there is no unmet office/labs need that the site needs to provide, and noting that an increase in housing would impact on the remaining land available for employment space and infrastructure. Given the significant housing need the plan needs to meet, the Councils consider it important to ensure that this site provides a significant number of homes; provision of a specific level of office and R&D floorspace here is considered less critical. However, noting the Transport Topic Paper 3 finding that providing a broad balance of jobs and homes is beneficial, the policy seeks to support this outcome in the final development mix.
- 3.48 With the relocation of the airport there will be some loss of industrial and engineering jobs, which the Councils would want to be re-provided as part of a range of employment provision. The [Greater Cambridge Industrial and](#)

[Warehousing Sector Study 2025](#) identifies a significant shortfall in industrial and warehousing space, and that Cambridge East is well placed to meet a proportion of that need- particularly for the general industrial and midtech sub-sectors. These sub-sectors prefer urban fringe locations, with good access for the urban population, but also with good access to the strategic road network. The Iceni study identifies an unmet need across Greater Cambridge for 50,000m<sup>2</sup> general industrial and 15,000m<sup>2</sup> midtech floorspace. Given this need and the opportunity provided by this site for such uses, the Councils consider 20,000m<sup>2</sup> an appropriate minimum amount of floorspace Cambridge East to provide. This space would be best located on the edge of the site, preferably with easy access to the A14.

- 3.49 The development strategy for Greater Cambridge is to direct any new homes, which includes specialist accommodation and Gypsy and Traveller pitches, to strategic sites on the edge of Cambridge and new settlements. It is therefore important that the policies for these allocations include specific requirements for specialist accommodation and Gypsy and Traveller pitches, as well as the overall number of homes to be provided. Cambridge East as a whole is required to provide 24 Gypsy and Traveller pitches and 10% of the approximately 8,000 dwellings as specialist accommodation. Additionally, Springstead Village is required to provide a retirement living facility in the form of bedspaces for older people, as agreed through the outline planning permission.

## **Green Belt Corridor**

- 3.50 Amongst the most fundamental features that contribute to the distinctive landscape setting and character of Cambridge are the network of green corridors, which provide a semi-rural landscape framework for the whole of the City. As well as providing the settings of key approaches to Cambridge for pedestrians and cyclists they contribute to the landscape setting of some edges of the City. These green spaces also function as corridors for the dispersal of wildlife, providing connectivity between habitats of nature conservation value in and around the urban area.
- 3.51 The Green Belt corridor at Cambridge East will extend Coldham's Common eastwards, opening to a greater width at the Teversham end to maintain a clear gap between Cambridge and Teversham. This will create an informal countryside character that will protect the village's identity and heritage assets, and rural outlook.
- 3.52 The current boundaries of the Green Belt corridor are retained for the purposes of the Local Plan. The current boundaries reflect a uniform width of

the Green Belt corridor of 300 metres over its whole length. When delivered, it is not necessary or expected that the Green Belt corridor will be of that or any uniform width, indeed that is not considered appropriate for the corridor to take that form. As envisaged in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan 2008, including the inspector's report, the ultimate boundaries of the Green Belt in this area are expected to be an output of a masterplanning exercise, which has yet to be completed. As such, the current boundaries of the Green Belt corridor will remain unchanged but, following completion of the masterplanning exercise, precise boundaries to reflect the masterplan will be confirmed via a review of the Local Plan. In the event that the masterplanning exercise is completed and a planning application for development affecting the green corridor is made before the conclusion of a review of the Local Plan, any development within the corridor will be determined having regard to extant development plan and Green Belt policy.

- 3.53 If it is demonstrated via the masterplanning process that locating some development within the retained Green Belt corridor is necessary to achieve high quality placemaking, this may amount to a consideration that could in principle contribute to a finding of very special circumstances to justify grant of planning permission for that development. In such a case, it will be necessary to show, as part of any planning application, that the function of the Green Belt corridor is maintained or enhanced. Where the masterplan shows development in the Green Belt corridor, there may be a requirement for compensatory widening of the corridor elsewhere in order to maintain the Green Belt function of the corridor.
- 3.54 The physical boundaries of the Green Belt corridor should be considered and determined through the same master-planning exercise.

## **Movement**

- 3.55 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority is preparing a Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy to address the specific challenges within the City, which it is anticipated will be completed alongside the next stage of the Local Plan.
- 3.56 The Greater Cambridge Local Plan Transport Evidence Report Part 4 Update 2025 outlines the transport mitigation needed to enable growth and this includes a vehicular 'trip budget' limiting the number of vehicle trips which can be accommodated on the highway network. The indicative trip budget for Cambridge East is approximately 1,500 trips in the AM peak and 1,800 trips in the PM peak (set out in Transport Topic Paper 2), which will be refined as more detailed evidence is completed. A 'monitor and manage' approach will

be implemented to ensure development remains within the trip budget throughout its delivery, an approach which has been utilised at other strategic sites including Alconbury Weald and Waterbeach New Town.

- 3.57 Cambridge East will need to deliver an exemplar approach to movement and transport within and through the site to achieve the 'trip budget'. The mix of development will need to achieve optimal transport outcomes, including high levels of site and city trip internalisation, and high active and public transport mode shares. This requires the development be designed and infrastructure provided from the outset to support a low car living approach, whereby locally provided services and facilities in 'walkable neighbourhoods' are readily accessible by walking and wheeling (by cycle and other wheeled modes such as scooters). Distinct neighbourhoods will be fully integrated by active travel modes and public transport but will not enable general through traffic although access for essential vehicles such as emergency services and service vehicles will be possible. This will be supported by innovative measures to promote low car ownership and support low levels of car parking.
- 3.58 Significant public transport and active travel improvements will be required including, but not limited to, new links to Cambridge Station, Cambridge Biomedical Campus, and into the City and onwards. Greater Cambridge Partnership's Eastern Access Scheme (Phase B) includes a new busway through the site linking the relocated Park and Ride, the main district and local centres within the site including Springstead Village, with the station and City centre. To enable high quality public transport services on other routes additional bus priority measures will be required, including the provision of a bus gate on Coldham's Lane.
- 3.59 East West Rail (EWR) are preparing a Development Consent Order application and are considering including a new railway station to the east of Cambridge. The Councils are fully supportive of this coming forward, noting the benefits such a station would bring in enabling a greater proportion of trips to and from Cambridge East to be via public transport, including from longer journeys. At the present time there remains uncertainty whether the station will be included in their plans, therefore it is not appropriate to include it in the draft Cambridge East policy. However, the Councils will continue to work with EWR to ensure that if a station is proposed that it is of the highest quality and integrates well with the proposed development, and further detail can be included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

## **Nature**

3.60 Cambridge East will include a strong and varied framework of green infrastructure throughout the development to create spaces for nature and people, as well as discrete spaces for biodiversity, in order to balance ecological enhancements and protection with amenity uses. This will include a network of green infrastructure and corridors throughout and linking the development parcels, and providing spaces for amenity, sport, recreation and play. Green infrastructure should include links to existing provision beyond the site boundary, to deliver the Nature Recovery Strategy priorities for ecological enhancements and aspirations of the Wicken Fen Vision for recreational use. Ahead of Proposed Submission, the Councils will explore further the scale and boundaries of the proposed offsite green infrastructure, including drawing on confirmed green infrastructure standards (see Policy BG/EO) and through engagement with the site promoter, relevant landowners, and other relevant local partners such as the National Trust and Cambridge Nature Network.

## **Marleigh and Springstead Village**

3.61 Marleigh and Springstead Village were able to progress as early phases of the full development that could come forward while the airport is still operational. Any future development proposals must be in accordance with their respective outline planning permission, approved masterplan and design code. For Springstead Village a retirement living facility must be provided.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

3.62 No additional alternative approaches identified.

## **Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations**

3.63 Support for the policy is noted; it continues to allocate Cambridge East for the development of a mixed-use city district with a comprehensive range of homes, jobs and associated community and social facilities to support multigenerational living, within a varied framework of green infrastructure and served by high quality transport networks.

3.64 Although Marshall Aerospace have announced their intention not to relocate the business to a new facility at Cranfield University (granted planning permission in 2023), the company remain committed to vacating the site by 2030, this will unlock the site for development which is anticipated to commence in 2032. The Local Plan is supported by a range of evidence to

demonstrate deliverability and viability. The delivery of Phase B of Cambridge Eastern Access is only required to serve the Cambridge East development and will provide a new public transport route through the site on land within the control of the developers. The policy includes a range of employment uses, including industrial uses to replace those lost when the airport relocates.

- 3.65 The findings of additional evidence, including a Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment, and Cambridge East Heritage Impact Assessment and Landscape Study, have informed the policy wording to ensure the new development is sensitive to and will respect and enhance local landscape, townscape and heritage, and integrates well with established and new neighbouring communities. There will be a strong and varied framework of green infrastructure throughout the development to create spaces for nature and people.
- 3.66 The site will deliver a new city district with approximately 8,000 homes of a mix of types, with cultural, community and commercial space to support an intergenerational community in vibrant, inclusive, mixed use, walkable (15 minute) neighbourhoods. Green streets, public spaces, and a new Cambridge Common will connect communities, promote wellbeing, and support nature recovery.
- 3.67 Cambridge East will create an exemplar of sustainable living with the highest standards of environmental performance and design excellence, supporting climate resilience.
- 3.68 Cambridge East will deliver an exemplar, inclusive, approach to movement and transport within and through the site, supporting a low car living approach, making 'walking and wheeling' an easy first choice for many residents, through provision of a series of well connected 'walkable neighbourhoods' served with local facilities. At the same time, transforming the wider connectivity of the eastern edge of Cambridge, with access to destinations such as Cambridge city centre and Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Cambridge East will not be completely car free although there may be some car free areas and through travel for general traffic will be discouraged. The policy includes an indicative vehicular 'trip budget' to mitigate the transport impacts arising from the site onto the wider highway network, and a monitor and manage approach will be taken to ensure that the development remains within the agreed trip budget for the site throughout its delivery.

## **Site specific further work and next steps**

- 3.69 Further testing and refinement of the site capacity will be necessary, including testing building heights to ensure taller buildings make a positive contribution to the Cambridge skyline, informed by the Greater Cambridge Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy.
- 3.70 Any refinement of the site capacity, together with the emerging Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy, will refine the transport mitigation package.
- 3.71 The Councils will continue to collaborate with EWR as further detail on the Development Consent Order application emerges to ensure that if a station is proposed that it is of the highest quality and integrates well with the proposed development.

## **Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

- 3.72 Provide policy guidance for development on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and consider whether further land should be released from the Green Belt and allocated for development.

### **How was the Issue Covered in the First Proposals Consultation?**

- 3.73 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed [Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus \(including Addenbrooke's Hospital\)](#)
- 3.74 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail. This can be viewed [Strategy Topic Paper 2021](#).
- 3.75 It should be noted that following the First Proposals Consultation an errata was published in relation to this policy. An error was identified in the online interactive version of the First Proposals. The third bullet in the Proposed Policy Direction for Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Policy S/CBC) was an error and did not reflect the wording agreed by the Councils for consultation. The interactive web based version of the First Proposals included a different third bullet to the pdf document version which was also available during the

consultation. The PDF document version reflects what was agreed by the Councils for consultation and is correct.

3.76 The policy was considered in the [Development Strategy Update 2023](#) and its supporting documents. The policy direction confirmed at that point was:

‘The proposed policy direction is that Greater Cambridge Local Plan should include the existing Cambridge Biomedical Campus, to meet local, regional or national health care needs or for biomedical and biotechnology research and development activities, related higher education and sui generis medical research institutes, associated support activities to meet the needs of employees and visitors, and residential uses where it would provide affordable and key worker homes for campus employees. The councils will continue to explore and confirm whether an exceptional circumstances case can be made for the allocation of additional land to the south and its removal from the Green Belt. Detailed policy requirements including the quantum and nature of the proposed development as well as the timing and phasing of delivery will be addressed in preparing the draft Local Plan, informed by the approach of the plan in respect of water supply and housing delivery.’

## Policy context update

### Written Ministerial Statement regarding Cambridge Biomedical Campus 8 May 2024

3.77 On 8 May 2024 Lord Michael Gove, then the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities issued [a Written Ministerial Statement](#) regarding the Cambridge Delivery Group which referred to the biomedical campus. It states:

‘The Cambridge biomedical campus is one such strategic site, as Europe’s leading centre for medical research and health science. At spring Budget, we announced a £7.2 million investment for locally led transport schemes to provide the Cambridge biomedical campus with connectivity and £3 million to support Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust to develop longer-term capacity and delivery plans for the site.

In addition, the Government are satisfied that the national importance of the greater Cambridge life sciences sector is sufficient to prompt, in principle, the early expansion and coherent delivery of this foremost UK life sciences cluster. In particular, the Government are satisfied that the

imperative to support this key sector provides sufficient justification for immediate collaboration between key stakeholders on development proposals coming forward ahead of the emerging local plan, to address the coherent enhancement, intensification and expansion of the Cambridge biomedical campus adjacent to Addenbrooke's Hospital.

One of the first priorities of the new growth company will be to support immediate collaboration between key stakeholders at the Cambridge biomedical campus. The growth company will also help to address any barriers to the early expansion and coherent enhancement of the campus, including through the accelerated delivery of any associated housing development and the provision of appropriate levels of affordable housing to meet the housing needs of those working at the campus.'

### **National Planning Policy Framework November 2024**

- 3.78 The National Planning Policy Framework received a significant update in November 2024.
- 3.79 Paragraph 87 requires that 'planning policies and decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for: a) clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries; and for new, expanded or upgraded facilities and infrastructure that are needed to support the growth of these industries (including data centres and grid connections)'
- 3.80 Paragraph 148 now states that where it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give priority to previously developed land, then consider Grey Belt which is not previously developed, and then other Green Belt locations.
- 3.81 The NPPF also introduces 'golden rules', that sites release for development in the Green Belt should meet, including higher rates of affordable housing, necessary improvements to infrastructure, and provision of green spaces accessible to the public.

### **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

- 3.82 Several respondents supported the proposal, with Fen Ditton PC noting that it reflected Cambridge's specific strengths. However, some respondents added caveats to their support, for example, the University of Cambridge argued that the proposed growth requirements were too restrictive. Other respondents

argued that the site's design needs refinement, and the Wildlife Trust stressed the continuing importance of protecting the city's green edge. One respondent argued that currently on the site there is an imbalance in the availability of facilities for research organisations compared to the general hospital, but they noted that planning gain from the proposal could be used to address this.

- 3.83 Some respondents submitted neutral comments, including citizens who asked for an assessment of whether the expansion was necessary after Covid-19. Other respondents requested for the masterplan to be redrafted to improve things such as cycle and pedestrian permeability. Several respondents used their feedback to focus upon technical elements of the proposal such as measurements and policy wording. Developers also submitted representations arguing that the proposal necessitated the delivery of additional housing.
- 3.84 Some respondents objected to the proposals. Reasons for opposition included environmental concerns, specifically relating to the perceived threat of flooding, carbon emissions potentially produced by the proposal and the adverse impact that the expansion could have upon red-listed farm birds which currently frequent the site. Other objections were justified on the basis that the proposal would negatively impact Green Belt land and harm the city's green edge. Some people felt that the proposal would be more suitable in other parts of Cambridge, or if it was in another area of the country.
- 3.85 In addition to these representations, question 5 of the questionnaire was also related to the extension of the Biomedical Campus. Many responses voiced similar concerns that appeared in the representations to the policy, particularly in relation to the proposal's potential impact upon the environment, green spaces, and flooding. Some comments asked for the proposal to improve the layout, traffic flow, and amenities of the Campus as well as the need to provide affordable housing for key workers. There were also different opinions about the types of jobs that should be delivered, specifically whether there should be an emphasis upon healthcare or research.

## New or updated evidence

- 3.86 Heritage Impact Assessment:** The HIA did not consider this to be a sensitive site, given the existing scale and form of existing buildings on the Campus and the intervening buildings between the site and heritage assets. The site forms the foreground and background of a number of Strategic Viewpoints but with careful design, including stepping down buildings on the edges of the Campus, development is likely to have a low risk to further impacts on views

of the city. Whilst archaeological finds are likely to be low on the existing Campus, there is moderate potential for significant archaeology on the expansion land. The implementation of design based mitigation, primarily in the form of building heights, mass, and screening should ensure no impacts on the setting of designated assets. Archaeological mitigation may be required. Residual risk is considered to be low to moderate. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

**3.87 Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, Areas of Search Assessment and Guidance: Appendix D:** Through initial building height testing, the study concludes that the site sits within several Strategic Viewpoints and is therefore relatively sensitive to additional height and mass. Generally, building heights up to 31.5m may be appropriate within the existing Campus, whilst lower heights and massing should be applied within the expansion land. However, this should be subject to further testing through the planning application process.

**3.88 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are some areas of the site at low risk of surface water flooding, and relatively small areas of medium and high risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with some areas of the site being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. There is an unmapped ordinary watercourse running through or adjacent to the site. Anecdotal and photographic evidence of basement flooding and ponding on the site has been brought to the Councils' attention, historically. Given the size of the site, it is likely that built development can be situated outside of areas of high flood risk using a sequential approach to the site's design. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

**3.89 Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study: Life science and ICT locational, land and accommodation needs 2024:** The Councils commissioned the 'Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study: Life science and ICT locational, land and accommodation needs' to consider the land supply and needs within these sectors. The study highlighted the need for Greater Cambridge's most successful locations such as the Cambridge

Biomedical Campus to continue to evolve to provide best in class occupier place based locations by ensuring accommodation across scale, enhanced connectivity and quality amenity. It highlights the need for future capacity to deliver a flexible supply.

- 3.90 New Strategic Allocations Assessment: Transport Mitigation Measures (WSP, September 2025):** In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, transport mitigation requirements have been identified that support safe and suitable access for all users, that ensure sustainable modes are prioritised and that the design of internal streets reflects the National Design Guide. Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network in terms of capacity and congestion or highway safety will need to be cost effectively mitigated through a vision-led Transport Assessment process. The measures identified in the strategic allocation proformas set out those transport interventions required to support sustainable and inclusive access for each site. It is important to note that these requirements will be subject to ongoing review and change as more detailed work is undertaken.
- 3.91 Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Addendum: Assessment of alternative scenario for Parcels RC10 and RC11 and Response to CBC submission on justification for realigning Granham's Road:** These reports explored the level of harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt should the Councils propose to release Green Belt land to the south of the existing Campus in the draft Local Plan. As part of this work, the studies also considered the harm to the purposes of Green Belt if Granham's Road was realigned and some additional land was released from the Green Belt beyond what was identified at First Proposals stage. CBC also submitted to the Councils their case for the realignment of Granham's Road, which was reviewed by the Councils Green Belt consultants.
- 3.92 Additional Landowner and Promoter Submissions:** The CBC Landowners Collaboration Group and CBC Limited have been developing further evidence to demonstrate the need for the development, and to respond to the issues identified in the First Proposals. Their submissions are included in the Document Library accompanying the consultation, and include the following:
- CBC Vision 2050
  - CBC Emerging Spatial Framework
  - CBC Case for Expansion
  - CBC Demand and Deliverability Report
  - Power of Proximity
  - Transport Strategy
  - Housing Paper
  - Spatial Framework Visual Commentary

- Hydraulic Modelling Summary
- Early Assessment of Amenity Requirement
- Realignment of Granham's Road
- Historical Environment Report
- Preliminary Ecological Report
- Economic Impact Assessment of CBC
- Healthcare Impact Study

**3.93 Further consideration of site capacity:** The capacity of the site has been informed by the information provided through the Call for Sites and informed by evidence, including the Heritage Impact Assessment where relevant. The proposed assumptions on development quantum are informed by capacity assessments presented by the site promoter and reviewed by planning officers. The capacity for this site is indicative and through the development of master planning and a planning permission, the capacity is subject to further review and refinement. Alongside this work, further work is also required to demonstrate that the site, and necessary supporting mitigation measures, are deliverable.

### Further information supporting draft policy approach

3.94 The current Addenbrookes Hospital was officially opened in 1962 with land released from the Green Belt for further expansion (known as Phases 1 and 2) in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). This allocation was carried through into the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) with the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) releasing some further Green Belt to the south of the Campus (known as Phase 3).

3.95 A safeguarded waste management site is located within the plan area. This is identified as "South west of Addenbrooke's Hospital, between Robinson Way and Addenbrooke's Road, Cambridge" Waste Management Area under Policy 16 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) (MWLP). The safeguarded site is for the Erection of an Energy Innovation Centre as part of the wider Biomedical Campus. Planning permission was granted in 2016 by Cambridgeshire County Council and subsequently was implemented by the construction of the underground tunnel connecting to the Hospital to the new site.

3.96 The draft Local Plan policy seeks to support the continued evolution of the site into a world class campus. For the existing site, phase 2 is currently under construction, and there is also development taking pace in earlier phases. Many of the older buildings are also in need of replacement. The policy needs to enable a coordinated approach to the completion of the existing campus,

which can respond to some of the problems and challenges with the current site. It has a range of shortcomings including an illegible layout, lack of green space, and lack of amenities for visitors and workers. Future masterplans need to address these shortcomings if the site is to deliver a world leading campus.

### **Considering whether a Green Belt Release is justified**

- 3.97 The Local Plan First Proposals consultation identified an area adjoining Babraham Road as a potential area to be released from the Green Belt specifically to meet the long-term needs of the Campus. The draft Local Plan needs to confirm whether exceptional circumstances exist for this release.
- 3.98 The NPPF requires at paragraph 145 that ‘Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified through the preparation or updating of plans. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries, having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they can endure beyond the plan period’.
- 3.99 At paragraph 146 it states, ‘Exceptional circumstances in this context include, but are not limited to, instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes, commercial or other development through other means. If that is the case, authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt, when considered across the area of the plan.’

### **Identifying the need to release land at the Biomedical Campus**

- 3.100 In terms of meeting the general need for housing and employment land, it is not considered that there are exceptional circumstances to release land from the edge of Cambridge. However, the issue to consider is whether the circumstances around the Cambridge Biomedical Campus are sufficient to justify a specific approach.
- 3.101 Whilst this site is only one of a number of life science sites in the Cambridge cluster, it offers the unique benefit of siting commercial research directly with the hospital. The Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study identifies that some businesses need to be in close proximity to clinical research.

Submissions by the Campus on ‘the Power of Proximity’ and the ‘CBC Economic Impact Study’ also provide evidence regarding those benefits.

- 3.102 The need is also not purely quantitative. In order to make the campus a sufficient quality to operate in a globally competitive market, it needs a high quality offer. Whilst there are many very high quality buildings and facilities on the site, many areas are lacking, providing a poor quality environment for workers and visitors. The expansion provides the opportunity to provide new facilities to enhance the site, but also support enhancement of the existing campus.

### **The nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt**

- 3.103 The Cambridge Green Belt Study (2021) identifies that the area adjoining Babraham Road and north of Granham’s Road would have ‘high’ harm to Cambridge Green Belt Purposes, and the area beyond would have ‘very high harm’.
- 3.104 The site proposed in the First Proposals consultation was bounded by Grahams Road to the south. An [errata was published in September 2022](#) as the interactive version of the First Proposals included as additional paragraph in error which identified that the realignment of Grahams Road may be appropriate. This was not part of the agreed First Proposals, but comments on the issue could be made at the next plan making stage.
- 3.105 In exploring the potential for the site allocation, the potential benefits of realigning Granhams Road have been considered, which would increase the area of the Green Belt release. This includes reviewing evidence submitted by the site promoters. It is considered that the realignment has the potential to improve the junction layout, proving improved connectivity to the park and ride and road access.
- 3.106 The revised site boundary would require land that forms part of a land parcel that the Green Belt Study identified as ‘very high’ harm, beyond the First proposals site which was classified as ‘high’ harm. The Councils commissioned a supplement to the Cambridge Green Belt Study (2021) to consider the impact of this change. The alternative scenario assessments for parcels RC10 and RC11 suggest that the realigned course of Granham’s Road would mark the distinction between land in RC11 that would cause ‘high’ harm if released from the Green Belt, and land in RC10 that would cause ‘very high’ harm. These are the same ratings that were assigned to RC10 and RC11 in the original assessment. Therefore, despite being located further into

the open countryside, the realigned Granham's Road would still mark the transition from 'high' to 'very high' harm.

- 3.107 In November 2024 the National Planning Policy Framework was updated to include the concept of grey belt. In effect when the need to release land from the Green Belt is identified, plans should give priority to previously developed land, then consider grey belt which is not previously developed, and then other Green Belt locations.
- 3.108 It is important that opportunities to reuse previously development land within the campus are utilised. However, these would not meet the long-term needs of the campus or provide the opportunity to create a world leading campus. There is no available previously developed land in close proximity to the site.
- 3.109 In terms of grey belt, the Cambridge Green Belt Study 2021 indicated that land in the vicinity of the campus was either significant or relatively significant to one or more Cambridge Green Belt purposes, and would have very high or high harm if developed. A review of the 2021 study is currently being undertaken to reflect the changes to the NPPF, which will include consideration of the new grey belt definition, but on current evidence this land would not meet the terms of being grey belt.
- 3.110 Even if there were potential sites elsewhere in the sub region, the needs and opportunities of the campus are specific to the site, and would not be met by developing land elsewhere. Therefore, in the case of this specific need there are not considered to be suitable or available previously developed or grey belt sites that could provide a reasonable alternative.
- 3.111 Finally, the NPPF also requires consideration of whether the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt, when considered across the area of the plan. This is the only released proposed by the draft plan on the edge of Cambridge. It is limited in extent, and is not considered to fundamentally undermine the purposes of the Green Belt.

### **Extent to which Green Belt harm can be mitigated**

- 3.112 In their assessment the Cambridge Green Belt Study 2021 advises, "It is necessary to assume that the land will be developed in order to reflect potential adverse impact, but it is recognised that there is potential for mitigation measures such as boundary strengthening and density of development within an inset area to influence this. Although the nature of development on released land could have some bearing on the strength of

adjacent retained Green Belt land, it is unlikely to radically alter assessment outcomes.’

- 3.113 Harm could potentially be reduced from the release of land from the Green Belt, by enhancing existing and developing new landscape features to provide a comprehensive approach to the southeast edge of the city.
- 3.114 Application of the Green Belt ‘golden rules’ would require the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. The draft policy requires enhancement to areas adjoining the site providing a mixture of more formal green spaces, and countryside enhancement.

### **Biodiversity**

- 3.115 The site has been subject to a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal submitted by the site promoters. There are a range of species and sites that will require mitigation through on site measures and in the wider policy area.

### **Flood Risk**

- 3.116 Updated flood mapping shows much of the existing campus and part of the potential Green Belt release at surface water risk during extreme events. The proposed Green Belt release is capable of being accompanied by mitigation which would make the site extension suitable, but also reduce risk to existing areas of the campus. The site promoters have submitted evidence which includes hydraulic modelling of the area to demonstrate that the land can be appropriately developed, and that through the proposed development flood risk could potentially be slightly reduced in the immediate area downstream of the site.
- 3.117 Whilst there are areas of Greater Cambridge that have a lower risk of flooding, there are specific reasons for considering development in this location related to the future needs of the Campus.

### **Transport**

- 3.118 The scale of development on the campus and the location means that high mode shares for walking, cycling and public transport will need to be achieved. The Campus benefits from connections to the Guided Busway, the nearby Babraham Road Park and Ride, and good cycling and walking connections. However, additional public transport improvements will be

needed in the corridor to the south east of the city. The Greater Cambridge Partnership has submitted an application to develop the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme, and a public inquiry is scheduled for late 2025.

3.119 The already pressured highway network will mean that any new development will need to achieve a very high share of visitors accessing the site by public transport or active travel means rather than the car and a trip budget is proposed to ensure this.

## **Infrastructure**

3.120 It is vital that the existing and expanded campus is supported by the right infrastructure. The scale of people visiting, working and living on the campus will need substantial investment in transport, services and facilities if the campus is to succeed and if impacts and surrounding communities are to be mitigated.

3.121 Interventions will include:

- Upgrades to movement within the campus, including linkages to the railway station
- Improvements to pedestrian and cycle links
- Contributions towards strategic transport infrastructure, including Cambridge South East Transport Scheme
- Landscape, biodiversity and water management
- Greenspaces
- Facilities for leisure, eating etc for staff, residents and visitors

3.122 The policy will require a comprehensive infrastructure, phasing and delivery schedule will need to be provided. This will need to be produced and agreed prior to development of further phases being granted planning permission, as improvement of the existing campus, and delivery of a world leading campus is a fundamental reason for the Green Belt release, not simply the development of another area of employment land.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

3.123 Previous stages considered a Green Belt release following the existing Granhams Road alignment. The draft policy proposes a new Granhams Road alignment leading to a larger Green Belt release.

## **Response to issues raised in representations**

- 3.124 Comments in support of the broad policy approach are noted.
- 3.125 Comments highlight the need for improvement of the existing campus. The policy is designed to enable this, and there is a clear case that the existing campus needs to be improved. Release of Green Belt land should assist in achieving this.
- 3.126 Some respondents expressed concern about whether there was enough focus on health provision as opposed to commercial research. Through engagement with the various stakeholders and landowners, the Councils understand that emerging proposals have the future of the hospital and care needs as key to the future success of the campus.
- 3.127 Respondents raise concerns about Green Belt release and whether the case was justified. As set out in the section above, having considered the case, the Councils consider that exceptional circumstances can be justified to release additional land to support the future needs of the campus. This has to be accompanied by enhancement to the adjoining land which remains in the Green Belt, including though the provision accessible open spaces, enhancement to the landscape, and biodiversity.
- 3.128 The policy does seek an element of residential development of the site, for a number of reasons. It will help the vitality of the campus, and support meeting needs of people that need to be close to the campus to support its activities. However, this quantity must also be balanced against the need for other uses. The development strategy in the draft local plan would deliver a number of major sites with good access via active travel of public transport to the campus.
- 3.129 Further analysis of the flood risk to the site has been carried out, and mitigation measures have been identified which will address the surface water flood risk for the expansion and the existing campus.

## **Site specific further work and next steps**

- 3.130 Further testing and refinement of the site capacity will be necessary, alongside the continued development of an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule for the Campus and further engagement with the landowners and other stakeholder to confirm a Delivery Strategy.

3.131 Any refinement of the site capacity, together with the emerging Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy, will refine the transport mitigation package.

## **Policy S/NWC: Eddington, Cambridge**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

3.132 To provide policy guidance for Eddington, formerly known as North West Cambridge. Eddington is a mixed-use development on the north western edge of Cambridge including land in both South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City. The site was allocated in the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (NWCAAP), adopted in October 2009, and large parts of the development are now complete. There is now an opportunity to deliver additional residential development and mid-tech employment uses within the existing site area by increasing the density of development, to meet the further needs of Cambridge University and the wider area.

### **Policy context update**

3.133 National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2024, including changes to Green Belt policy, and guidance regarding development density.

3.134 This policy will supersede the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (NWCAAP) which was adopted in 2009.

### **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

3.135 Issues raised in the representations include:

- Allocation will increase need for full day care provision for pre-school children.
- More primary school places are needed.
- GCSP should encourage the co-location of establishments to promote partnership working.
- GCSP should encourage developers to provide free plots of serviced land or purpose-built buildings.
- Additional infrastructure must also include provision of strategic green infrastructure.
- Development site contains an ancient tree, appropriate measures need to retain and protect this tree and its root system.
- Recommendations of HIA should be used to inform the policy wording.
- Should deliver medical centre and pharmacy before consent for next phase.

- Need to preserve ecologically sensitive area within the land parcel known as 'the 19 acre field'.
- All new developments over a certain size should provide a minimum of 50% affordable housing in line with the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan. The loophole in page 83 of the First Proposals where developers could deliver less than this on the North West site should be removed.

## New or Updated Evidence base

- 3.136 **Heritage Impact Assessment:** The HIA notes that the site consists of two distinct areas, a north-western site consisting of greenfield and brownfield land and a south-eastern site comprising of greenfield land. Storey's Way Conservation Area abuts the eastern edge of the site, and the West Cambridge Conservation area borders the western edge of the site. The Conduit Head Conservation is also located near the site.
- 3.137 Within 500 metres of the site there are four Grade II\* Listed Buildings, eighteen Grade II Listed Buildings, one building with a Certificate of Immunity, one Grade II Registered Park and Garden, archaeological material spanning from prehistoric to the modern period, and the potential to intrude upon Strategic Viewpoint 2- Madingley Rise, Madingley Road. The HIA notes that development poses a moderate risk to Conservation Areas within and next to the site, and a moderate risk to archaeology on the site, but development poses a low risk to Listed Buildings and the Registered Park and Garden, a low risk to strategic viewpoints, and it poses no risk to the building which has a Certificate of Immunity and no risk to archaeology within 500 metres distance of the site. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 3.138 **Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, Areas of Search Assessment and Guidance: Appendix D:** Through initial building height testing, the study concludes that the site sits within several Strategic Viewpoints. Generally, building heights below 19m are unlikely to have adverse impacts on the skyline, whilst in some parts of the site, buildings could be up to 25.5m, subject to further testing at the planning application stage.
- 3.139 **New Strategic Allocations Assessment: Transport Mitigation Measures (WSP, September 2025):** In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, transport mitigation requirements have been identified that support safe and suitable access for all users, that ensure sustainable modes are prioritised and that the design of internal streets reflects the National Design Guide. Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network in terms of capacity and congestion or highway safety will need to be

cost effectively mitigated through a vision-led Transport Assessment process. The measures identified in the strategic allocation proformas set out those transport interventions required to support sustainable and inclusive access for each site. It is important to note that these requirements will be subject to ongoing review and change as more detailed work is undertaken.

- 3.140 **Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 11: Meeting the specialist housing needs of older people and those with disabilities (2025):** Potential sources of supply to meet the identified accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities, taking account of the development strategy, have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the specialist accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities. It includes recommendations for a proportion of new homes at existing and new strategic sites to be provided as specialist accommodation, particularly for older people or those with disabilities.
- 3.141 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that large areas of the site have planning permission and construction of the approved development has commenced. A small proportion of the site is within Flood Zone 3 (<1% of the total site area), but the majority of the site (>99%) is situated in Flood Zone 1. Some areas of the site are at high, medium or low risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with some areas of the site being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level and at surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. There are unmapped ordinary watercourses running through and/or adjacent to the site. Given the size of the site, it is likely that built development can be situated outside of areas of high flood risk using a sequential approach to the site's design. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 3.142 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The capacity of the site has been informed by the information provided through the Call for Sites for the available land remaining that is yet to be developed from the existing Outline permission. Information provided as part of the Call for Sites demonstrated that Phase 1 had been developed at a higher density than originally envisaged. As such it is clear that there is potential to increase the capacity of the site using similar or higher densities informed by the specification and mix

of dwellings, which, along with changes to car parking (significant reductions over that in Phase 1) creates the potential for an uplift beyond that in the Call for Sites information. This can be achieved by maintaining appropriate building heights and scale transitions, that do not unduly impact local and strategic views and optimising the efficient use of land in a sustainable location.

### **Further information supporting draft policy approach**

- 3.143 The Eddington site was released from the Green Belt in 2009 to help meet the needs of the University of Cambridge for academic buildings, business space and homes. Eddington is developing into a dynamic new quarter for Cambridge, with around 1850 homes already built alongside green spaces and community facilities.
- 3.144 There is now an opportunity to review the masterplan for the site. Reflecting on how the site has been built so far, and looking at how it will meet needs in the future, it can accommodate more homes than was originally envisaged in the 2009 plan whilst continuing to meet wider needs and deliver a high quality environment. This will ensure that the long-term needs of the University of Cambridge, as a centre of excellence and a world leader in higher education and research, are met throughout the plan period, while also providing for the wider community.
- 3.145 The new policy continues the emphasis on innovative urban design and establishing Eddington as an exemplar of sustainable living. It includes ambitious measures to reduce car dependency and encourage active and sustainable modes of travel. Development at Eddington must also respect its sensitive location on the Green Belt edge, safeguard the unique character of Cambridge, and carefully consider its relationship with the neighbouring community of Girton.
- 3.146 The new policy retains a similar level of employment uses, but the emphasis for commercial uses has been moved towards mid tech, which mixes industrial uses with offices and research and development. This reflects needs identified in employment sector studies informing the Local Plan.
- 3.147 A new outline planning permission will be required to secure the additional growth. Impacts arising from this uplift will be appropriately mitigated through a Section 106 Agreement, ensuring that sufficient services, facilities, and infrastructure are delivered to support the development and the communities it serves. Other strategies for the site will also need to be updated addressing a

range of issues including transport, biodiversity, drainage and water management.

3.148 This policy will replace the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan adopted 2009 Area Action Plan when it is adopted.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

3.149 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

3.150 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Allocation will increase need for full day care provision for pre-school children, and more primary school places are needed. – The infrastructure needs of the site will be required to address this either on site or through funding via planning obligations.
- GCSP should encourage the co-location of establishments to promote partnership working - This issue will be addressed by other policies in the Local Plan.
- Should encourage developers to provide free plots of serviced land or purpose-built buildings. – Policies are proposed in the draft local plan regarding provision of affordable workspace.
- Additional infrastructure must also include provision of strategic green infrastructure - This issue will be addressed by other policies in the Local Plan, which will include policies regarding green infrastructure delivery.
- Development site contains an ancient tree. Appropriate measures need to be taken to retain and protect this tree and its root system. - Policies in the Local Plan address protection of important trees and the wider issue of canopy cover.
- Recommendations of HIA should be used to inform the policy wording. – Consideration of heritage issues have been included in the draft policy.
- Should deliver medical centre and pharmacy on the existing site before consent is obtained for the next permission – The further health care needs generated by the development will be required to be considered through the planning application process, and addressed as appropriate through planning obligations.
- Need to preserve ecologically sensitive area within the land parcel known as 'the 19 acre field'. – development proposals will be required to consider their impact on biodiversity.
- All new developments over a certain size should provide a minimum of 50% affordable housing in line with the North West Cambridge Area Action

Plan. The loophole in page 83 of the First Proposals where developers could deliver less than this on the North West site should be removed. – the draft policy maintains the approach of seeking 50% affordable housing to meet the needs of Cambridge University and College key workers.

## **Policy S/WC: West Cambridge**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

3.151 Continue to provide a policy for future development of the West Cambridge site, to support the site in meeting the needs of the University, for uses related to education and research, and associated commercial research and development, where it will support knowledge transfer and/or open innovation from these for the wider Cambridgeshire and UK economy. It is also proposed to add flexibility to the policy, to allow an element of residential for site employees, where it would support making the campus become a more vibrant employment location.

### **Policy context update**

3.152 National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2024, including changes to guidance regarding development density.

### **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

3.153 Issues raised in the representations include:

- Policy doesn't acknowledge East-West rail route and its consequences.
- Dwelling numbers and density should be included in the policy.
- GCSP should consider joining this policy with the policy for North West Cambridge to make one overarching policy for the area.
- Development must better integrate neighbouring communities and acknowledge the character of the West Cambridge Conservation Area.
- Section 106 Agreements from the 1999 permission to provide a cycle route from the east of the site to Grange Road have not been fulfilled.
- Important to protect remaining green spaces.
- Recommendations of the HIA should be used to inform policy wording. Any policy for the site should refer to heritage assets and the need to conserve and enhance the significance of these assets including any contribution to that significance by settings.

## New or Updated Evidence base

**3.154 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that this predominantly a brownfield space with some undeveloped, green areas. The HIA notes that a very small part of the area intrudes into the West Cambridge Conservation Area and abuts Conduit Head Road Conservation Area. The 20<sup>th</sup> century Grade II\* Listed Building, the Schlumberger Gould research Centre, is present within the site. Within 500 metres there are three Grade II\* Listed Buildings, and eighteen Grade II Listed Buildings. The HIA states that the site is captured within strategic Viewpoints 2 Madingley Rise, Madingley Road, and Strategic Viewpoint 14, Coton footpath over the M11. The HIA notes that inappropriate development could potentially pose moderate risk of impact to views to the city. The HIA recommends implementing design-based mitigation to mitigate potential impacts on strategic viewpoints and the setting of Listed Buildings. It recommends retaining open green space to the east and west of the Schlumberger Gould Research Centre to preserve its setting. It also states that overall maximum building height should not exceed 4 storeys. Archaeological investigation will also be required with possible further mitigation if any remains are found. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

**3.155 Planning Permission:** Development at the West Cambridge site has been incremental since the 1950s with a first masterplan for the site developed in 1966. The most significant developments on the site were the School of Veterinary Sciences 1953-55 and the existing Cavendish II Laboratory constructed in the 1970s.

**3.156** In 1999 an outline planning application for the site (planning reference 97/0961/OP) was granted permission for Cambridge University academic departments (73,000 square metres), research institutes (24,000 square metres), commercial research (41,000 square metres), sports centre (10,120 square metres), shared amenities (including shops, food and drink and lecture theatre), 200 residential units, park and cycle facilities and associated infrastructure. It was reviewed and updated in 2004.

**3.157** Planning permission was granted on 21st June 2024, under planning reference 16/1134/OUT for the following work which is to densify the development on the site:

**3.158** Outline planning permission (16/1134/OUT) with all matters reserved for up to 383,300 square metres of development comprising up to 370,000 square metres of academic floorspace (Class D1 space), commercial/research

institute floorspace (Class B1b and sui generis research uses), of which not more than 170,000 square metres will be commercial floorspace (Class B1b), up to 2,500 square metres nursery floorspace (Class D1), up to 4,000 square metres of retail/food and drink floorspace (Classes A1-A5), up to 4,100 square metres and not less than 3,000 square metres for assembly and leisure floorspace (Class D2), up to 5,700 square metres of sui generis uses, including Energy Centre and Data Centre, associated infrastructure including roads (including adaptations to highway junctions on Madingley Road), pedestrian, cycle and vehicle routes, parking, drainage, open spaces, landscaping and earthworks, and demolition of existing buildings and breaking up of hardstanding.

- 3.159 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The capacity of the site has been informed by the information provided through the Call for Sites, the outline planning permission for the site and the existing Cambridge Local Plan allocation for the site. The site capacity reflects the masterplan approved through the Outline Permission under 16/1134/OUT proposes up to 170,000 square metres gross internal area of B1(b) Research and development floorspace. This permission has informed the site capacity for employment floorspace.

### **Further information supporting draft policy approach**

- 3.160 The West Cambridge site is operated by the University of Cambridge. The site is undergoing major change and developing its role as a development cluster for university science and technology research, knowledge transfer and open innovation. The site has been developed incrementally since the 1950s, with its first masterplan in 1966. In 1999 the first outline planning permission was granted for the site leading to a number of developments. A revised and more densely developed scheme has more recently been granted planning permission in 2024, providing a long-term vision and strategy for the comprehensive development of the site, and creation of the West Cambridge Innovation District.
- 3.161 This policy will support the continued development of the site to meet the aspirational needs and overall placemaking vision for the site and wider area. This policy builds upon the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 carrying forward the site for development. It supports the continue development of the site, whilst seeking a mix of supporting uses to make it a vibrant innovation location connected to the wider city. It also enables and encourages the addition of residential development for the purpose of bringing vitality to this district beyond the normal working day. The policy encourages the continuation of providing excellent sustainable movement links beyond the site, particularly with Eddington, to enable services and facilities to be shared.

3.162 The policy encourages the continuation of providing excellent sustainable movement links beyond the site, particularly with Eddington, to enable services and facilities to be shared.

3.163 Any increase in development, particularly for residential, will require further mitigation and provision of services and facilities to be secured through a S106 Agreement.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

3.164 No Policy – Not considered a reasonable alternative as this would not provide a context for the future evolution of the site and would fail to ensure the site is available to contribute to the University's and the City's future needs or provide a policy framework for planning decisions.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

3.165 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Policy doesn't acknowledge East-West rail route and its consequences. - The route is not going near the site; therefore, a specific response in this policy is not necessary.
- Dwelling numbers and density should be included in the policy – It is not proposed to identify a specific number of dwellings in the policy, or rely on the site to meet overall need for residential development. Instead, the policy signals direction for the future of the site to support its evolution.
- GCSP should consider joining this policy with the policy for North West Cambridge to make one overarching policy for the area – The draft local plan does seek integration of these areas, acknowledging the opportunity for coordination and shared benefits.
- Development must better integrate neighbouring communities and acknowledge the character of the West Cambridge Conservation Area - Development requirements have been added to the policy to fulfil this aim.
- Section 106 Agreements from the 1999 permission to provide a cycle route from the east of the site to Grange Road have not been fulfilled. – The outline planning permission revisited site connectivity.
- Important to protect remaining green spaces. – the masterplan incorporates open spaces, and the draft local plan will continue to seek open space as part of new development.
- Recommendations of the HIA should be used to inform policy wording. – Heritage considerations have been included in the draft policy.

## Policy S/HHR: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

### Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to

3.166 The adopted 2018 Local Plans allocate developments on land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road in Cambridge, referred to as Darwin Green. The site has planning permission, but the local plan needs to provide a context should there be further applications prior to completion of the site to ensure sustainable development.

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

3.167 Issues raised in the representations include:

- access from Cambridge Road is inadequate and being so close to the Kings Hedges junction will cause traffic disruption,
- drainage must be designed so that the existing baseflow is not diminished as this would cause environmental harm, and
- allocation of this area for development results in loss of significant areas of green space that integrate Cambridge with its rural surroundings.
- The need to protect an ancient tree on site;
- Impact on local environment.

### New or Updated Evidence base

3.168 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that the Cambridge part of the allocation is covered by a Design Code. As a result, the HIA concludes that there are no heritage risks identified assuming that development is developed within the height parameters established by the agreed Design Code. The HIA also identifies no heritages risks for the South Cambridgeshire part of the allocation. The key issues for this site are considered to be the risk of impacting the Strategic Viewpoints (should significant height be proposed) and potential archaeological features. However, assuming development is sympathetic to the local prevailing building height then there is low risk / no risk of impact on views to the city. The HIA concludes that there is moderate potential for significant archaeology on site and recommends appropriate mitigation. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

3.169 **Planning permission:** The part of the site that falls within Cambridge is split into NIAB Frontage and NIAB Main (or Darwin Green). NIAB Frontage has detailed planning permission for 187 dwellings (C/03/0282 and 07/1124/REM),

and 153 dwellings have been completed. Planning permission for non-residential development on the land where the remaining 34 dwellings would have been sited has now been built. NIAB Main has outline planning permission (07/0003/OUT) for up to 1,593 dwellings, a primary school, community facilities, and retail units (use classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5), which was approved in December 2013. More detailed development proposals have subsequently come forward through six reserved matters applications and a full application which have all received permission and total 1,573 dwellings in addition to a library, community rooms, health centre, retail units, allotments and public open space. An additional planning permission (21/03609/FUL) exists for land at the former NIAB Headquarters Building which was approved in February 2024 for 291 Build to Rent units and a 202 bed Apart-Hotel (Sui Generis). There is another application (23/04643/OUT) on the same site for laboratory / office (Class E (g(i)) and (g(ii))) and café use (class E(b)), and associated facilities which is still pending consideration. For the part of the site within South Cambridgeshire (known as Darwin Green 2/3), outline planning permission (22/02528/OUT) for up to 1,000 dwellings, secondary school, primary school, community facilities, retail uses, open space and infrastructure works, was allowed on appeal in September 2024.

3.170 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The two existing site allocations in the Local Plan have been brought together into one site allocation. The site capacity is based on the approved planning permission and capacity previously proposed in the adopted Local Plan.

3.171 The HIA recommends implementing design-based mitigation to limit potential impacts on the local and wider skyline, townscape character and setting of listed buildings. Development up to or less than 5 storeys, as currently approved, is considered appropriate within the north-western part of the site. Development of the south-eastern part of the site may infill a key area of separation between the approved schemes in the north-western part of the site and designated assets near the site. Therefore, the HIA recommends minimising the size and scale of development in this south-eastern area, along with the inclusion of landscape buffers and screening. The site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings. The HIA notes that the approved schemes within the north-western part of the site will exceed local prevailing building heights, increasing risk of conflict with policies relating to the setting of heritage assets. The HIA also recommends archaeological mitigation, with further mitigation works required if remains are found.

3.172 **New Strategic Allocations Assessment: Transport Mitigation Measures (WSP, September 2025):** In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, transport mitigation requirements have been identified that

support safe and suitable access for all users, that ensure sustainable modes are prioritised and that the design of internal streets reflects the National Design Guide. Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network in terms of capacity and congestion or highway safety will need to be cost effectively mitigated through a vision-led Transport Assessment process. The measures identified in the strategic allocation proformas set out those transport interventions required to support sustainable and inclusive access for each site. It is important to note that these requirements will be subject to ongoing review and change as more detailed work is undertaken.

- 3.173 Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 11: Meeting the specialist housing needs of older people and those with disabilities (2025): Potential sources of supply to meet the identified accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities, taking account of the development strategy, have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the specialist accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities. It includes recommendations for a proportion of new homes at existing and new strategic sites to be provided as specialist accommodation, particularly for older people or those with disabilities.
- 3.174 **Planning Permission:** Outline planning permission was granted under references 11/1114/OUT and S/1886/11 on 22/02/2013 (Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council) for the following work:
- 3.175 Proposed development comprising up to 3,000 dwellings; Up to 2,000 student bedspaces; 100,000 square metres employment floorspace, of which: up to 40,000 square metres commercial floorspace (Class B1(b) and sui generis research uses) and at least 60,000 square metres academic floorspace (Class D1); up to 5,300 square metres gross retail floorspace (Use Classes A1 to A5) (of which the supermarket is 2,000 square metres net floorspace); Senior Living, up to 6,500 square metres (Class C2); Community Centre; Indoor Sports Provision; Police; Primary Health Care; Primary School; Nurseries (Class D1); Hotel (130 rooms); Energy Centre; and associated infrastructure including roads (including adaptations to Madingley Rd and Huntingdon Rd), pedestrian, cycle and vehicle routes, parking, drainage, open spaces and earthworks.
- 3.176 These applications were subsequently varied by changes to the approved Parameter Plans under planning permissions 13/1402/S73 and S/2036/13/VC on 21/11/2013 and 25/11/2013 respectively.

- 3.177 A S106 Agreement with a Deed of Variation relates to these outline permissions.
- 3.178 There have subsequently been several non-material amendments and approval of details under several reserved matters applications and full permissions for elements of the scheme.
- 3.179 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The capacity of the site has been informed by the information provided through the Call for Sites for the available land remaining that is yet to be developed from the existing Outline permission. Information provided as part of the Call for Sites demonstrated that Phase 1 had been developed at a higher density than originally envisaged. As such it is clear that there is potential to increase the capacity of the site using similar or higher densities informed by the specification and mix of dwellings, which, along with changes to car parking (significant reductions over that in Phase 1) creates the potential for an uplift beyond that in the Call for Sites information. This can be achieved by maintaining appropriate building heights and scale transitions, that do not unduly impact local and strategic views and optimising the efficient use of land in a sustainable location.

### **Further information supporting draft policy approach**

- 3.180 The current local plans allocate developments on the north west edge of Cambridge, referred to as Darwin Green. Phase 1 of the site (which is wholly within Cambridge) has outline planning permission, and some parcels have detailed planning permission or are under construction. Phase 2 of the site (which is wholly within South Cambridgeshire) has also gained planning permission. Given the site will still be coming forward when the new plan is adopted it is proposed to carry forward the allocations into the new plan.
- 3.181 The former NIAB Headquarters Building has been excluded from the allocation.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

- 3.182 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

- 3.183 Access from Cambridge Road has already been agreed in principle with County Highways. However, detailed proposals including mitigation

requirements will be identified at the planning application stage. No change to policy approach.

3.184 The draft local plan includes policies to ensure flooding and drainage are appropriately addressed. The environmental impacts of the development and any mitigation requirements have also been considered at the planning application stage

3.185 The Green Belt and the Countryside Enhancement Strategy will ensure separation from Girton and Histon & Impington villages. No change to policy approach.

## **Policy S/EOC: Other site allocations on the edge of Cambridge**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

3.186 To help meet the need for new housing and jobs in Greater Cambridge by identifying specific site allocations for housing or employment development on the edge of Cambridge.

### **Policy context update**

3.187 National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2024, including changes to Green Belt policy.

## **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

3.188 Issues raised in the representations include:

- **Proposed approach to site allocations:** Support from some for the overall approach to allocations on the edge of Cambridge, however suggestions included:
  - need to prevent urban spawl,
  - exceptional circumstances exist to release land from the Green Belt,
  - sustainable villages on the edge of Cambridge should be considered for more growth,
  - need to allocate some smaller greenfield sites that can be built out faster, and
  - new developments must be sensitive to the landscape and natural environment.
  - principle of development of these sites has already been established, however need to consider heritage assets and

- recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.
- existing adopted allocations should be reviewed and not automatically carried forward, and assurance provided regarding their delivery and ability to meet housing need.
  - **Rejected sites:** Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.
  - **Site specific comments:**
    - **Land south of Worts' Causeway (S/EOC/GB2):**
      - need to ensure that the green hedgerow and tree lined footpath along Worts' Causeway is maintained through this development.
    - **Bell School (S/EOC/BS):**
      - new student accommodation should be sensitive to the evolving local area and meet the standards of the new plan.
    - **Fulbourn Road West 1 & 2 (S/EOC/GB3 & GB4):**
      - full assessment of traffic impact from this amount of development is needed.
    - **Fulbourn Road East (S/EOC/E/3)**
      - full assessment of traffic impact from this amount of development is needed.
      - concerns about further development at Fulbourn Road East on highly productive farmland.
    - **Cambridge Southern Fringe (R42a: Clay Farm, R42b: Trumpington Meadows, and R42c: Glebe Farm 1 & 2):**
      - need for continued support for residents to ensure they become part of an integrated community.

3.189 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement.

### Further information supporting draft policy approach

3.190 Policy S/EOC identifies the list of sites that are allocated for housing or employment uses on the edge of Cambridge, and the specific development requirements for each site that should be met alongside all other relevant Local Plan policy requirements. It highlights that the number of homes or floorspace included in the policy is indicative and that what is permitted should be determined through a design-led approach at the planning application stage.

- 3.191 The Local Plan must allocate sites for new housing and employment development to meet the long-term housing needs of Greater Cambridge and support the forecast new jobs in the area. The edge of Cambridge is a highly sustainable location for additional homes and jobs due to its accessibility to existing jobs, services, and public transport.
- 3.192 The sites allocated have been identified taking into account of a range of factors, and informed by the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment. For the employment allocations, we were also informed by the evidence from the Greater Cambridge Employment Land Review & Economic Development Evidence Base (2020) to understand the locational demand of different sectors.
- 3.193 The identified specific development requirements for each of the sites are necessary to ensure that the likely impacts of the development will be adequately mitigated. National planning policy and other policies in the Local Plan may require further development requirements and / or contributions that are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
- 3.194 Land north and south of Worts' Causeway need to respond to their landscape and historic environment setting, including provision of a landscape buffer to provide an appropriate edge to the city. In addition to being a Building of Local Interest, Netherall Farm is also an established bat roost. Development proposals should ideally retain the existing bat roosts but if this is not possible they must be re-located. The adjacent Netherall Hall Farm County Wildlife Site makes an important contribution to the biodiversity of the wider site and a long-term management plan will be required to maximise this contribution. However, the plan should also look at the opportunities to achieve more gains along the corridor between Land North of Worts' Causeway and Land South of Worts' Causeway through the retention of a country lane appearance which should be part of any landscaping proposals.
- 3.195 The Bell School site is the remaining undeveloped part of the previous site allocation in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. The new allocation will provide 100 student rooms that will help to meet the needs of the educational facility adjacent to the site. The Bell Educational Trust Limited has advised that they remain committed to the delivery of the 100 student bedrooms to enable provision of the full amount of accommodation needed for the site.
- 3.196 The Fulbourn Road East site includes criteria to ensure that development responds to its setting and the character surrounding area, in particular Cambridge's Green Belt, Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area and neighbouring properties.

## Additional alternative approaches considered

3.197 No additional alternative approaches identified.

## Response to issues raised in representations

3.198 Responses to general issues raised in representations include:

- **need to prevent urban sprawl:** the edge of Cambridge is a highly sustainable location in Greater Cambridge, and sites have been allocated to make the most of its accessibility to existing jobs, services and public transport. A variety of sites have been considered through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) process and assessed against the development strategy for the Local Plan, and those sites identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated. In identifying whether a site is suitable, the HELAA has considered each site in relation to the adopted development plan policies, and also assessed its impact on a range of issues such as landscape, townscape, biodiversity, and the historic environment.
- **exceptional circumstances exist to release land from the Green Belt:** housing needs alone are not considered to provide exceptional circumstances to justify removing non-strategic sites from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, as sufficient supply has been identified from sites in other sustainable locations that will not result in harm to the Green Belt. Non-strategic sites on the edge of Cambridge within the Green Belt have been considered individually to determine whether there are site specific exceptional circumstances to justify their release from the Green Belt.
- **sustainable villages on the edge of Cambridge should be considered for more growth:** a variety of sites have been considered through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment process and assessed against the development strategy for the Local Plan, and those sites identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated. Allocations for new homes and jobs have been identified across Greater Cambridge, taking account of the development strategy for the Local Plan which seeks to focus growth in the most sustainable locations whilst also recognising the need to support the vitality of villages.
- **need to allocate some smaller greenfield sites that can be built out faster:** a variety of sites across Greater Cambridge have been included as allocations in the draft Local Plan, including smaller greenfield sites. Together with a range of sites that already have planning permission, and small windfall housing developments that will be brought forward in the future as allowed by other policies in the Local Plan, this collectively

results in a diversity of sizes and types of housing sites anticipated to be delivered throughout the plan period.

- **new developments must be sensitive to the landscape and natural environment:** through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA), the proposed development for each site has been assessed in terms of its impact on a range of issues such as landscape, townscape, biodiversity, and the historic environment. Any mitigation measures identified within the HELAA site assessment as being necessary to make the proposed development acceptable have been included as site specific development requirements.
- **need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording -** Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared for each of the allocations on Worts' Causeway and along Fulbourn Road and informs the policy wording. The proposed student accommodation at Bell School has detailed planning permission.
- **existing adopted allocations should be reviewed:** all adopted allocations have been reviewed alongside new sites, and those that continue to be identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated.
- **requests for specific sites to be allocated:** new or updated evidence and representations received to the First Proposals consultation have all been considered, and those sites that continue to be identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated.

**3.199** Comments were made on **Cambridge Southern Fringe (R42a: Clay Farm, R42b: Trumpington Meadows, and R42c: Glebe Farm 1 & 2)** about the need for continued support for residents to ensure they become part of an integrated community. As these developments have been or are being built out there is no need for a policy framework any longer, and so the allocations are not proposed to be carried forward.

**3.200** The response to issues raised in representations relating to other specific sites are included in the response to issues raised in representations section of the specific allocation in the Individual Site Allocations section.

## Individual Site Allocations

### Housing

#### S/EOC/NWO: Land north of Worts' Causeway

New or updated evidence

3.201 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** to understand the impacts of development on the historic environment, including specific assets and their setting. The HIA describes the site as predominantly greenfield with a 19th century farm complex. The farm buildings are Historic Environment Records (HER) features and are Locally Listed Buildings. The site also forms the rural context for some strategic viewpoints. The HIA states that specific consideration of the current buildings on site is required and retention should be considered. The implementation of design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building height, style, and materials, should limit impacts on the setting of designated assets, however, should prevailing heights be exceeded this could increase risk. The HIA also states that there are opportunities for design to enhance character and setting of heritage assets through the inclusion of a suitable landscape buffer to preserve their rural character. Archaeological mitigation will be required, particularly as the site abuts the Roman road Wort's Causeway and there is evidence of land undisturbed by modern ploughing present within the site. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

3.202 **Planning permission:** Outline planning permission (20/01972/OUT) for up to 200 dwellings was granted on 7 January 2022. Approval of matters reserved (23/04191/REM) was granted on 19 August 2024.

3.203 **Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and site specific evidence have been considered and the indicative capacity of approximately 200 homes reflects previous assessments. The capacity for this site was considered sound as part of the site allocation in the adopted Local Plan, and there has been no material change since that would suggest that the capacity needs to be amended.

Response to issues raised in representations

3.204 No representations were submitted relating to this allocation in the First Proposals consultation.

#### S/EOC/SWO: Land south of Worts' Causeway

New or updated evidence

3.205 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA): to understand the impacts of development on the historic environment, including specific assets and their setting. The HIA states that the implementation of design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building height, style, and materials, should limit impacts on the setting of the designated asset and characteristics of Cambridge, however, should prevailing heights be exceeded this could increase risk. It also states that there are opportunities for design to enhance character and setting of heritage assets. Archaeological mitigation will be required, particularly as the site abuts the Roman road Wort's Causeway and there is evidence of land undisturbed by modern ploughing present within the site. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

3.206 Planning permission: Outline planning permission (19/1168/OUT) for up to 230 dwellings and up to 400 sqm of non-residential floorspace was granted on 24 May 2021. Reserved matters permission (21/04186/REM) for the main entrances to the north and south of the site, the primary vehicular route and corresponding adjacent hard and soft landscaping and junctions onto secondary routes was granted on 21 October 2022. Reserved matters application (22/02646/REM) for appearance, landscape, layout and scale for Phase 2 comprising the creation of 80 residential units, hard and soft landscaping including the creation of a central square and associated works was granted on 30 August 2023. At April 2025 the site had been cleared. Reserved matters application (24/01531/REM) for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for Phase 3 comprising the final 150 residential units and 400 sqm of community and commercial floorspace was granted on 12 December 2024.

3.207 Further consideration of site capacity: the site submission and site specific evidence have been considered and the indicative capacity of approximately 230 homes (30 dwellings per hectare) reflects previous assessments. The capacity for this site was considered sound as part of the site allocation in the adopted Local Plan, and there has been no material change since that would suggest that the capacity needs to be amended.

#### Response to issues raised in representations

3.208 A comment referenced the need to ensure that the green hedgerow and tree lined footpath along Worts' Causeway is maintained through this development – the existing hedgerow and tree lined footpath should form part of the approach to retaining the rural character of the approach to the city along the A1307 and has been added to the policy requirements.

## **S/EOC/BS: Bell School, Babraham Road**

New or updated evidence

**3.209 Further consideration of site capacity:** The site's capacity has been agreed through the planning application process. Any revision to the agreed capacity should take account of all relevant planning policies, including any relevant matters raised during the planning application process.

Response to issues raised in representations

**3.210** Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- new student accommodation should be sensitive to the evolving local area and meet the standards of the new plan - any new student accommodation (or any other use) proposal that requires new planning consent will need to conform with the applicable policy framework set out in the new Local Plan.

## **Employment**

### **S/EOC/FRE: Fulbourn Road East**

New or updated evidence

**3.211** Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA): The HIA notes that the site is partially greenfield land situated close to Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area, with low tree screening between the site and the Conservation Area. There are no designated or non-designated heritage assets on the site. The HIA notes there is a moderate risk of impact upon views into Cambridge as the site could impinge upon Strategic Viewpoint 7, which originates from Little Trees Hill, Magog Downs and includes a vista across the city from the south-east, and Viewpoint 9 which originates from Worts Causeway and Shelford Road and also includes a vista across the city from the south-east. The HIA recommends that design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of managing building heights and massing and that development at a scale similar to the building height to the north and west might be appropriate. It states that appropriate materials should be used to reduce visual intrusion. The HIA suggests restricting the scale or presence of development in the eastern portion of the site. It also recommends maintaining and strengthening screening around the site, particularly to the south and east. The site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings. The HIA notes that archaeological evaluation has occurred, and further mitigation may be required. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

3.212 Planning Permission: In 2022, an appeal (reference APP/W0530/W/22/3298055 ) was granted for hybrid planning permission for the development of up to 56,473m<sup>2</sup> of commercial floorspace for Use Classes E(g) i (offices), E(g) ii (research and development), E(g) iii (light industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution - limited to data centres) uses and associated enabling works. The site's development capacity has been updated to reflect this planning context.

3.213 Further consideration of site capacity: the site submission and analysis of the capacity of similar sites has been used to determine an indicative floorspace for this allocation. The proposed indicative capacity is appropriate considering the constraints on the site relating to height, massing, and siting of new buildings.

#### Response to issues raised in representations

3.214 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Full assessment of traffic impact from this amount of development is needed - the HELAA noted that the proposed development is acceptable from a highways and transport perspective provided the necessary mitigation measures are identified, secured and implemented at the planning delivery stage. The planning decision stated that, in accordance with T1/2 and T1/3 of South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan, an updated Transport Assessment, Travel Plan, and Parking Strategy should be included as part of any reserved matters application.
- Concerns about further development at Fulbourn Road East on highly productive farmland - This issue was considered through the previous Local Plan process where, on balance, it was considered acceptable given the wider economic and social benefits of allocating the site for the intended uses.

## **Adopted allocations not proposed to be carried forward in the draft Local Plan**

### Housing

3.215 The following residential allocations within the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 have been or are being built out and are sufficiently advanced that they do not need a policy framework any longer, and are therefore not proposed to be carried forward:

- R42a: Clay Farm, south of Long Road
- R42b: Trumpington Meadows
- R42c: Glebe Farm 1 & Glebe Farm 2

## **4. New Settlements**

4.1 This chapter provides a background summary of the evidence and representations received from earlier stages of consultation on New Settlement sites.

### **Approach to New Settlements in First Proposals**

4.2 The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [New Settlements](#)

4.3 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: [Strategy Topic Paper](#)

### **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

4.4 Issues raised in the representations include:

- Broad support for new settlements, while noting the need to ensure that they have their own identity and provide the necessary services, facilities, public transport and other infrastructure.
- Sport England highlight need to provide significant on-site facilities for sport and physical activities, with requirements identified through evidence.
- Parish Councils support the use of brownfield sites, and reduction of allocations on greenfield sites.
- Some site promoters' comments highlight the potential for further new settlements to be identified, including by creating new settlements around existing infrastructure and services.
- Other site promoters' highlight the need for a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge and the problems of focussing on large sites. Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

4.5 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the [Consultation Statement](#).

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

4.6 Support for the new settlements approach in the First Proposals is noted.

- 4.7 Some representors propose alternative strategies and question the approach to new settlements. However, in the context of greater Cambridge, and when considering green belt policy, they are considered an appropriate element of the strategy for meeting development needs.
- 4.8 Representors raise the importance of infrastructure delivery to meet the needs of new settlements. The draft local plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Strategy, which seeks to identify at an early stage the infrastructure that will be needed, how much it costs and how it will be funded.
- 4.9 In addition to the existing sites, and number of sites have been suggested through the call for sites process. These have been tested and considered against alternatives, and in order to meet development needs a further new settlement site has been identified. Further information on the site selection process and reasons can be found in the Strategy Topic Paper.

## **S/CBN: Cambourne North**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

- 4.10 This is a new allocation to contribute towards the identified housing need and demand for additional employment land in the Greater Cambridge area.

### **How was the issue covered in the First Proposals Consultation?**

- 4.11 Cambourne was identified as a broad location for strategic scale growth in the First Proposals. This reflected the uncertainty at that time around the deliverability of the A428 upgrade project, East West Rail and its potential route alignment and Cambourne station location and the Cambourne to Cambridge Guided Busway.
- 4.12 The expansion to Cambourne was identified to deliver around 1,950 homes during the Plan period (up to 2041), with the overall number of homes to be delivered post-2041 to be confirmed.
- 4.13 The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [Policy S/CB: Cambourne](#)
- 4.14 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: [Strategy Topic Paper](#)

## Policy context update

- 4.15 Since First Proposals, the A428 upgrade project has received planning consent and is currently under construction. This project will significantly improve the road network in this area and better connect Cambourne with the A1 to the west and other settlements across the OxCam region.
- 4.16 East West Rail Co. has carried out non-statutory consultation on their emerging project, which identifies a new station to be located to the north of the existing town of Cambourne. There has also been the recent announcement that Universal Studios are proposing a new theme park in Bedford, which would be served by the new railway.
- 4.17 The Cambourne to Cambridge Busway project has now advanced to public inquiry as part of the consents process under the Transport and Works Act Order process. An outcome of this study is anticipated in 2026.
- 4.18 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 included Policy SS/8: Cambourne West. Permission has now been granted for development in this location, and a development of 2,350 homes, employment and supporting facilities near to the village college is now under construction. Other planned developments in the area include Bourn Airfield, a new settlement allocated in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 for around 3,500 homes and other supporting uses.

## Summary of Main issues arising from First Proposals representations

- 4.19 There were mixed views expressed for an expansion to Cambourne within the representations from across the range of respondents:
- Support for making the most of improved transport connections, the opportunity it presents to make the existing town more sustainable and expanding the employment provision and services and facilities available,
  - Agreement that it should be landscape-led and provide a good amount of green space.
  - The new development should provide facilities including facilities such as a swimming pool, more sports facilities and retail, plenty of green space for nature and people including parks and nature trails, and improved sustainable transport connections including for active modes both within Cambourne and to surrounding villages.
  - There were mixed views around transport provision and in particular the relationship with East West Rail (EWR) and the current uncertainty around its delivery.

- Some respondents were opposed to further development in the absence of or before delivery of EWR and others opposed the EWR proposal itself. It was suggested that with the slow delivery of the GCP Cambourne to Cambridge scheme other forms of transport require consideration. Other respondents seek to maximise the opportunity EWR presents to create a transport hub and maximise opportunities for sustainable travel and achieve integration with the town.
- Concerns were expressed by Parish Councils and developers as to whether expansion of Cambourne was necessary and whether development would be better spread across the area.
- Several site promoters submitted sites in the vicinity of Cambourne and nearby villages for consideration.
- Concerns raised against further expansion include the potential loss of Cambourne's character from over-development, the potential impact on neighbouring villages and the need to maintain their separate identity, and the need to explore how Cambourne will function with nearby villages.
- Other concerns related to potential impacts on landscape, open space, biodiversity, and the historic environment. It was questioned whether additional employment would be achievable.

## New or Updated Evidence

### **Cambourne Economic Study**

4.20 The Cambourne Economic Study reviews the local economy in Cambourne, Greater Cambridgeshire and beyond. It considers the property market in terms of different types of commercial space such as offices, laboratories and industrial/warehousing. The Study considers the options for the focus of economic growth and concludes that growth at Cambourne has the potential to reset the economic purpose of Cambourne so that it becomes a self-sustaining regional town, in particular it creates the opportunity for industrial-tech and R&D jobs to be located here. To achieve this will require long term vision, planning and commitment, going against the current commercial trend in that location.

4.21 The Cambourne Economic Study considers scenarios for employment including Cambourne as a commuter town, a mid/mixed tech/industrial focus, an ICT/life sciences focus or a mixture of sectors. To achieve higher levels of jobs actions will be needed by public sector partners including creating a sense of place attractive to employers and capturing an anchor tenant.

## **Strategic and site specific Heritage Impact Assessments**

- 4.22 The Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment examines, at a high-level, the potential impact of development on the historic environment of a defined study area around Cambourne. It considers designated and non-designated heritage assets, within 17 zones around Cambourne. The study analyses the significance of these assets and how vulnerable they are to the effects of development. This includes analysing the assets' surroundings, and the likelihood of finding undiscovered archaeological remains.
- 4.23 A more detailed site specific HIA was also undertaken to consider the heritage impacts of the preferred spatial option. Within the proposed allocation area and wider Strategic Enhancement Area (SEA), there are a number of prehistoric, Roman, medieval and post-medieval archaeological remains, with potentially further remains possible. There are also 49 listed buildings within 500m of the development area and SEA, including Grade I listed Parish Church of Holy Trinity, the Grade II\* Childerly Hall Registered Park and Garden and Conservation Areas to the north. Within the site, there is a Grade II listed New Inn farmhouse and associated listed barns. The HIA sets out that design-based mitigation is required to reduce potential impacts on archaeological remains, the rural skyline, and the setting of the Grade II listed New Inn Farmhouse and its associated barns. This should include identifying development zones that avoid encroachment on these heritage assets, managing building heights and massing, particularly along the northern ridgeline, and using materials sympathetic to the historic agricultural character of the area.
- 4.24 The site is not considered appropriate for tall or visually prominent buildings, especially in its northern and eastern zones where visibility from Rogues Lane is highest. These requirements should inform any layouts and design codes for future development on the site.
- 4.25 At this early stage, it is considered that there is a moderate risk that development will have adverse impacts on heritage assets and their setting. However, the HIA also notes that extensive and well considered mitigation measures will be required and, if applied, the risk could be reduced to low.
- 4.26 Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

- 4.27 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. Areas of the site are within 100 metres of Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3. Very small proportions of the site are at high, medium or low risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with some areas of the site being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level and at surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. There are unmapped ordinary watercourses running through and/or adjacent to the site. Given the size of the site, it is likely that built development can be situated outside of areas of high flood risk using a sequential approach to the site's design. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities.
- 4.28 The Level 2 assessment for the site suggests that allocation of the site does not require the Exception Test. It should be possible to locate all development outside of these extents using a sequential approach to development, however this should be confirmed with site-specific hydraulic modelling of the ordinary watercourses that run through the site. The developer will need to provide a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), which demonstrates that future users of the development are safe from flood hazards from all sources throughout its lifetime. A series of FRA and site design recommendations have been provided as part of the assessment that will need to be considered during the design of the site or the component phases of development. The adjacent Strategic Enhancement Area (S/SEA/CBN: Non-development Area Adjacent to Cambourne North) may also offer opportunities to reduce flood risk through nature-based solutions. Where appropriate, the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency should be consulted to discuss hydraulic modelling and proposed flood risk mitigation measures.

### **Cambourne Green and Blue Infrastructure Framework**

- 4.29 The Green and Blue Infrastructure Framework included as an Appendix to the Spatial Framework Strategy describes the 'landscape led' approach which has informed the proposed growth. The Framework identifies how the existing context has informed the development of the Green and Blue Infrastructure network, including taking into consideration habitat networks, blue infrastructure, access networks and heritage assets. The Framework applies the Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework to guide the 'landscape-led' approach. The Framework sets out characteristics of the framework

including creating landscape linkages, buffers to protect habitats and creating 'dark corridors'.

### **Cambourne Sustainability and Net Zero Framework**

4.30 The Cambourne Sustainability and Net Zero Framework included as an Appendix to the Spatial Framework Strategy considers sustainability and net zero considerations created by the expansion of Cambourne. It considers the wider policy context and a series of best practice case studies to inform a vision and priority actions for Cambourne. The study concludes that the scale of opportunity at Cambourne lend itself to ambitious sustainability and net zero targets. It recommends the Cambourne should minimise embodied carbon emissions, be net zero in operation, integrate circular economy principles, demonstrate best practice in water use efficiency and on-site water reuse, promote active transport, embed climate change mitigation and adaption and seek to first protect and restore habitats that have a high carbon stock value.

### **Cambourne Spatial Options Report**

4.31 An options appraisal process was undertaken to consider the most suitable way to expand Cambourne. A long list appraisal considered whether Cambourne should be expanded to the North, East, West, South or combinations thereof. Expansion North, West, and North West were identified as the shortlisted options because they offer the best alignment with transport connectivity and are most likely to be deliverable since sites in these directions are being promoted for development.

4.32 These three options were then considered in more detail as part of a short list appraisal undertaken using criteria informed by the Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal. This process recommended that the North option was taken forward for further testing as part of the Spatial Framework, with consideration of expansion to the West in the longer term.

### **Cambourne Spatial Framework Strategy**

4.33 The Cambourne Spatial Framework Strategy sets out a vision for how Cambourne could be expanded. The document includes a baseline assessment identifying the local constraints. It sets out a vision for Cambourne which is for it to continue to grow into a distinct and self-sustaining community, with thriving town centres that supports and celebrates the best of Cambridgeshire life. The vision is supported by a series of

objectives for growth. The Spatial Framework Strategy is illustrated in a key concept diagram. The Strategy also considers three character areas in more detail: new town centre and station quarter, employment and residential, describing some of the key characteristics of these areas. The Councils have used this Strategy to inform the draft Spatial Framework that supports the emerging allocation.

## **Cambourne Growth Transport Strategy and Infrastructure Requirements Report**

- 4.34 The transport strategy sets out the requirements that will enable the Spatial Framework Strategy to deliver a sustainable movement network, that seeks to promote movement by walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport and contain as many trips as possible within the development itself, reducing the need to deliver expensive and complex infrastructure and capacity enhancements to the road network. It has been developed to strike a balance between competing ambitions to enhance nature, protect landscapes, deliver growth in homes and jobs whilst providing a comprehensive movement network that prioritises travel by sustainable means.
- 4.35 The report includes a Transport Strategy Vision and design principles that have helped to formulate the overarching Spatial Framework. It also includes a Travel Demand model that has allowed a more detailed understanding of the likely number of movements from the growth area. This demand has been derived using the assumptions of the number of homes and jobs proposed. The report applies these to two scenarios; a business as usual and vision-led approach to understand what growth may mean for movement across different modes of transport. This work has been used to inform the Spatial Framework, for example the number of crossings over the Strategic Road Network and the proposed EWR alignment, and the wider movement networks.

## **Cambourne Rail Integration Study**

- 4.36 East West Rail (EWR) could be the key catalyst for growth at Cambourne, however, if the railway and new station do not integrate with the built form of Cambourne in the right way, many of the potential benefits of EWR's arrival will not be able to be realised. This study lays out the vision for how EWR should integrate with growth at Cambourne, in line with the wider vision and Spatial Framework. It includes recommendations to help 'stitch' existing Cambourne together with the growth area including delivering five high quality, human-friendly multi-modal crossings across EWR and the A428 at strategic locations, lowering the alignment of the railway between the dumbbell roundabout and new active crossing, and delivering a new

landbridge between existing Cambourne and the new station. It also includes recommendations for the new EWR station to be moved westwards to a more central location and it being a station that faces both to the north and south. At the time of writing EWR Co. Ltd. were considering the recommendations in this study.

### **Cambourne to Cambridge Busway Integration Report**

- 4.37 The proposed Cambourne to Cambridge (CtoC) Busway will play a vital role in connecting both existing and future development to key destinations in Cambourne and Cambridge, including employment areas, education, and healthcare. However, the full benefits of the Busway will only be realised if it is fully integrated with the form and function of the existing Cambourne settlement and with what has been set out in the Spatial Framework.
- 4.38 The Cambourne to Cambridge Busway Integration Report sets out a vision for how a future Busway extension, over and above the proposals produced by Greater Cambridge Partnership, could and should be integrated with Cambourne and aligned with the emerging Spatial Framework Strategy growth ambitions. It explores the connectivity challenges, identifies key integration opportunities and route options, and makes recommendations for delivering a well-integrated and future-proofed Busway.

### **Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment**

- 4.39 A number of sites were submitted as part of the First Proposals consultation (2021) and Site Submission Update (2025). This looked at each site individually as well as the proposed allocation area. A number of areas were considered result in high levels of potential adverse impacts including on landscape character, archaeology and ecology. The studies outlined above set out how the Councils have sought to undertake further evidence to explore these areas further and identify necessary policy requirements for the draft allocation as well as identifiable mitigation measures.
- 4.40 **New Strategic Allocations Assessment: Transport Mitigation Measures (WSP, September 2025):** In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, transport mitigation requirements have been identified that support safe and suitable access for all users, that ensure sustainable modes are prioritised and that the design of internal streets reflects the National Design Guide. Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network in terms of capacity and congestion or highway safety will need to be cost effectively mitigated through a vision-led Transport Assessment process.

The measures identified in the strategic allocation proformas set out those transport interventions required to support sustainable and inclusive access for each site. It is important to note that these requirements will be subject to ongoing review and change as more detailed work is undertaken.

- 4.41 Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers (2025):** The Accommodation Needs Assessment (ANA) of Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Showpeople, Bargee Travellers, and other caravan and houseboat dwellers for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (September 2024) makes a series of recommendations for meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Greater Cambridge. Each of the recommendations in terms of potential sources of supply have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Greater Cambridge. It includes recommendations for new Gypsy and Traveller sites to be provided at existing and new strategic sites.
- 4.42 Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10c: Design of Gypsy and Traveller Sites (2025):** The Councils are proposing that strategic sites, such as new settlements and urban extensions, include sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. To inform the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within these strategic sites, it is necessary to consider: what is an appropriate number of pitches for each strategic site, and the amount of land required for different sizes of Gypsy and Traveller sites. This report sets out recommendations for the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites, based on the evidence collated, and is used to inform the anticipated delivery of Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites in 4.42 Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers.
- 4.43 Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 11: Meeting the specialist housing needs of older people and those with disabilities (2025):** Potential sources of supply to meet the identified accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities, taking account of the development strategy, have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the specialist accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities. It includes recommendations for a proportion of new homes at existing and new strategic sites to be provided as specialist accommodation, particularly for older people or those with disabilities.

## **Further consideration of site capacity**

- 4.44 The capacity of the site has been informed by the evidence exploring future development potential at Cambourne. . The Spatial Framework Strategy for Cambourne North sets out density testing at a strategic level for this stage, and has been published as supporting evidence for this plan.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

- 4.45 Expansion of Cambourne to the south – this alternative is not the preferred approach because it has poor alignment with transport connectivity and has limited potential for significant growth.
- 4.46 Expansion of Cambourne to the east – this alternative is not the preferred approach because it has poor alignment with transport connectivity and has limited potential for significant growth.
- 4.47 Expansion of Cambourne to the west– this alternative is not the preferred approach because it has poor alignment with transport connectivity.

## **Further information supporting draft policy approach**

- 4.48 National planning policy states that through the preparation of Local Plans, planning authorities should look to the opportunities provided by major new infrastructure. Cambourne has been identified as the location for a new East West Rail station whilst the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge busway scheme will also enhance the connectivity of Cambourne by public transport. Additionally, the update to the A428 is currently well underway. Subject to approval, the public transport projects will mean Cambourne is a highly accessible town, within a short travel time of some of Cambridge's key employment areas including the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and the City Centre. Westwards, Cambourne will also be well connected to other major towns and cities along the Ox-Cam Arc.
- 4.49 The expansion of Cambourne provides the opportunity to bring forward development in a location which is highly accessible by sustainable modes, and at the same time support the existing town so that it becomes more sustainable and can offer the services and facilities of a modern town. The options appraisal process undertaken during the preparation of the Plan identified that expansion to the north of Cambourne provides the best alignment with transport connectivity and the best potential for growth.
- 4.50 The Spatial Framework Strategy describes the process to identify the extent of growth and capacity of Cambourne. Constraints were considered including

flood risk, nature sites and habitats, and heritage assets. The extent of growth was then identified considering the ambition for growth to be landscape led and the need to reduce the visual impact of development as well as the need to create a buffer-with surrounding villages. The location of major land uses and design of the southern edge of the extension will ensure the expansion area is well integrated with the existing settlement. A number of objectives are also identified in the Spatial Framework Strategy, which provide the key characteristics for Cambourne's expansion to be successful.

- 4.51 The road network in South Cambridgeshire is reaching capacity, in particular roads into Cambridge. Development at Cambourne will be subject to a vehicular trip budget to ensure that development does not result in unmanageable congestion on the surrounding road network during peak hours. The trip budget will be set through the emerging Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy and underpinned by transport modelling work. Further work will be undertaken with stakeholders to better understand future road network upgrades and network demand management measures to improve the local movement network and reduce severance, supporting trip internalisation, where people don't have to travel beyond the town for day to day services, facilities and employment opportunities, and a higher sustainable mode share.
- 4.52 There are several natural environmental sites within the boundary of the allocation which have important ecological and biodiversity value, such as Knapwell Wood. These sites must be carefully managed to avoid further deterioration of these irreplaceable habitats, and measures including avoidance zones. The area to the north contains Ancient Woodland, sites of special scientific interest (SSSI), and a county wildlife site (CWS). Detailed surveys will be required to inform enhancement and management planning and lighting strategies.
- 4.53 Evidence suggests that large scale development at Cambourne would have landscape impacts and that these would be challenging to fully mitigate. The expansion of Cambourne should therefore be landscape led to minimise impacts as much as possible. The *Cambourne Green and Blue Infrastructure Framework* included in the *Spatial Framework Strategy* has identified opportunities to create and connect blue and green infrastructure through a new regionally significant district-scale woodland arc (Cambourne Forest) and through a series of green and blue linkages throughout development.
- 4.54 Greater density is identified as a priority for Cambourne's expansion due to the need to create a 'critical mass' of people for the provision of services and facilities, and need for high levels of sustainable mode share and trip

internalisation (as identified in **the Cambourne Transport Strategy and Infrastructure Requirements report**). The proposed East West Rail station and busway provide good opportunities to enable greater density of development. The policy identifies a number of elements to be considered as part of the design and development of neighbourhoods to ensure sufficient diversity and flexibility in types and tenures of housing, along with types of community and social infrastructure provision.

- 4.55 The Cambourne Economic Study has identified significant potential for employment growth at Cambourne, due to improved transport connectivity created by East West Rail and Cambourne to Cambridge Busway. However, it identified that this employment space is unlikely to be successful unless it is highly integrated with the rest of the town and has easy access to transport and amenities. The policy therefore identifies a number of required characteristics of employment uses to support the successful generation of greater economic activity.
- 4.56 There are significant infrastructure challenges relating to water, waste, and energy in South Cambridgeshire, which represent absolute constraints to Cambourne's expansion unless mitigated and that these new measures are sequenced ahead or alongside the provision of new homes and jobs. In addition, climate change will result in a need for greater sustainability and resilience from an expanded Cambourne. **The Sustainability and Net Zero Framework** identifies these challenges and identifies potential measures to respond to them.
- 4.57 Community and stakeholder engagement has suggested that build quality, delivery mechanisms and stewardship of public spaces have been key factors in the challenges and successes of Cambourne's growth to date. Cambourne's expansion will therefore need a carefully developed approach to planning, delivery, and stewardship to ensure that the aims of the policy can be delivered.
- 4.58 Engagement with community representatives (Town, Parish, District and County Councillors) has informed the preparation of this allocation. However, further engagement with community members and key stakeholders should be sought to inform detailed design and development of the expansion of Cambourne. To aid this the applicant must prepare an Engagement Strategy to agree an approach with the LPA for all future phases of development.
- 4.59 The Councils are aware that additional evidence studies are required to further explore and plan for the known constraints and issues within this area. This additional evidence alongside the comments from the draft Local Plan

consultation will inform the allocation for this site Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) Local Plan.

## Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

4.60 Responses to main issues raised in representations include:

- Support for making the most of improved transport connections, the opportunity it presents to make the existing town more sustainable and expanding the employment provision and services and facilities available. The draft policy sets out a positive policy direction and level of ambition for the site.
- Agreement that it should be landscape-led and provide a good amount of green space. This is a key requirement in the policy for ecological, landscape and well-being purposes.
- The new development should provide facilities including facilities such as a swimming pool, more sports facilities and retail, plenty of green space for nature and people including parks and nature trails, and improved sustainable transport connections including for active modes both within Cambourne and to surrounding villages. This is a key requirement within the policy.
- There were mixed views around transport provision and in particular the relationship with East West Rail (EWR) and the current uncertainty around its delivery. Since 2021, the Government has further outlined its support for the EWR project. The publication of the non-statutory consultation further emphasises the prospect of the project being delivered.
- Some respondents were opposed to further development in the absence of or before delivery of EWR and others opposed the EWR proposal itself. It was suggested that with the slow delivery of the GCP Cambourne to Cambridge scheme other forms of transport require consideration. Other respondents seek to maximise the opportunity EWR presents to create a transport hub and maximise opportunities for sustainable travel and achieve integration with the town. Through partnership working with infrastructure bodies and providers, we are seeking to ensure that development of the site would align with the delivery of transport infrastructure projects.
- Concerns were expressed by Parish Councils and developers as to whether expansion of Cambourne was necessary and whether development would be better spread across the area. Based on the Councils evidence, locating development in this location based on the planned infrastructure projects, is a more sustainable option than dispersing development across a wider area, including villages with few facilities or access to high quality public transport.

- Several site promoters submitted sites in the vicinity of Cambourne and nearby villages for consideration. The site submissions received have been considered through the HELAA process.
- Concerns raised against further expansion include the potential loss of Cambourne's character from over-development, the potential impact on neighbouring villages and the need to maintain their separate identity, and the need to explore how Cambourne will function with nearby villages. This is a key component of the draft policy, where we are seeking to ensure the identity and character of nearby villages is protected.
- Other concerns related to potential impacts on landscape, open space, biodiversity, and the historic environment. It was questioned whether additional employment would be achievable. Further work has been undertaken in relation to these issues and incorporated within the policy.

### Further work and next steps

4.61 The supporting technical evidence prepared is proportionate to this stage of plan preparation and seeks to balance the constraints and opportunities in concluding the spatial framework and policy parameters for the draft Cambourne North allocation for 13,000 new homes, 6,000 new jobs and supporting infrastructure.

4.62 Consideration is being given to the next stage the Local Plan programme and the requirements of further development of the supporting technical evidence, this includes:

- **Transport Evidence** - Further exploration of transport impacts and opportunities, and mitigation measures.
- **Landscape Visual Impact Assessment** - Likely impact on landscape has been assessed through desktop assessments at this stage and through stakeholder engagement. Further on-site assessments to refine landscape impacts and the detail of proposed mitigations.
- **Ecology Strategy** – to further explore and refine relationship with existing habitats and species and opportunities for mitigation and enhancement.
- **Archaeological Assessment** - The assessments undertaken by GCSP have been inform by Historic Environment Record data and engagement with the County Council Archaeological Team and Historic England.
- The councils are currently exploring with relevant stakeholders whether further work is required on this matter ahead of the Regulation 19 consultation.
- **Continued exploration of infrastructure requirements** - Given the strategic scale of expansion, multiple landowners, added complexity of the

EWR project, the infrastructure ends of the site and other delivery related issues will continue to be explored.

## **S/CB: Cambourne**

### Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to

- 4.63 To provide continued guidance for the development of the existing allocation at Cambourne West and permitted development at Cambourne Business Park. It also provides a specific policy framework for development proposals that may come forward within the existing Cambourne Town Centre (High Street) as well as improved connections to the proposed Cambourne North development (Policy S/CBN).

### How was the issue covered in the First Proposals Consultation?

- 4.64 Cambourne was identified as a broad location for strategic scale growth in the First Proposals. This reflected the uncertainty at that time around the deliverability of the A428 upgrade project, East West Rail and its potential route alignment and Cambourne station location and the Cambourne to Cambridge Guided Busway.
- 4.65 The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [Policy S/CB: Cambourne](#)
- 4.66 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: [Strategy Topic Paper](#)

### Policy context update

- 4.67 The original masterplan concept for Cambourne was for three distinct but connected villages. The villages of Lower, Great and Upper Cambourne have now largely completed but there remains a large part of the High Street that is yet to be delivered. In 2017, outline planning permission was granted for Cambourne West, a fourth village which would include a new secondary school and further employment uses. The development of Cambourne West continues to take place whilst Cambourne has now developed the status of becoming a town, the first in South Cambridgeshire.
- 4.68 With the proposed allocation of Cambourne North (Policy S/CBN), this policy also sets out what is required to enable the growth of the town to come forward in a comprehensive way.

## Summary of Main issues arising from First Proposals representations

4.69 There were mixed views expressed for an expansion to Cambourne within the representations from across the range of respondents:

- Support for making the most of improved transport connections, the opportunity it presents to make the existing town more sustainable and expanding the employment provision and services and facilities available,
- Agreement that it should be landscape-led and provide a good amount of green space.
- The new development should provide facilities including facilities such as a swimming pool, more sports facilities and retail, plenty of green space for nature and people including parks and nature trails, and improved sustainable transport connections including for active modes both within Cambourne and to surrounding villages.
- There were mixed views around transport provision and in particular the relationship with East West Rail (EWR) and the current uncertainty around its delivery.
- Some respondents were opposed to further development in the absence of or before delivery of EWR and others opposed the EWR proposal itself. It was suggested that with the slow delivery of the GCP Cambourne to Cambridge scheme other forms of transport require consideration. Other respondents seek to maximise the opportunity EWR presents to create a transport hub and maximise opportunities for sustainable travel and achieve integration with the town.
- Concerns were expressed by Parish Councils and developers as to whether expansion of Cambourne was necessary and whether development would be better spread across the area.
- Several site promoters submitted sites in the vicinity of Cambourne and nearby villages for consideration.
- Concerns raised against further expansion include the potential loss of Cambourne's character from over-development, the potential impact on neighbouring villages and the need to maintain their separate identity, and the need to explore how Cambourne will function with nearby villages.
- Other concerns related to potential impacts on landscape, open space, biodiversity, and the historic environment. It was questioned whether additional employment would be achievable.

## New or Updated Evidence

4.70 **Planning Permissions:** Planning permission was granted in 2024 within Cambourne Business Park for 256 new homes, a café and landscaping

improvements (23/00123/FUL) and development is currently under construction. Outline planning permission was granted in 2017 for development known as Cambourne West (S/2903/14/OL). This was for up to 2,350 homes, retail floorspace, employment, community and leisure uses as well as new schools. A number of the initial phases of development have since been completed, including one of the primary schools and the new secondary school and development continues to take place across a number of the residential phases.

- 4.71 **Planning update:** A planning application was submitted in 2024 for the continued development of Cambourne High Street. The proposal is for a mixed use scheme including retail units, residential homes above as well as enhancements to the public realm. To date, this application has not been determined. The draft allocation for Cambourne (Policy S/CB) sets out the Council's aspirations for the High Street area (the existing designated Town Centre).
- 4.72 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The site capacity has been informed by previous designation in the Local Plan and by the planning history for the site. The majority of Cambourne has been delivered. A number of smaller sites within the existing boundary of Cambourne have been identified for further development. This includes a site with planning permission in the high street for 120 units, in the business park for 256 units with planning permission, and West Cambourne for 2350 units with planning permission. The total capacity of this site allocation is based on the additional sites identified not the existing settlement of Cambourne.

#### Additional alternative approaches considered

- 4.73 No additional alternative approaches identified.

#### Further information supporting draft policy approach

- 4.74 Cambourne has developed from a group of small villages into a town, more recently in a piecemeal way that lacks a strong vision. This has resulted in development proposals coming forward incrementally and with limited consideration given to their wider context, with examples of poor connectivity between different neighbourhoods and a lack of sustainable community facilities and service provision. This policy is needed to provide a more coherent, coordinated framework for the ongoing buildout and future renewal of other parts of Cambourne, and to ensure the town maximises the potential of future planned transport connectivity enhancements and seamlessly

integrates with new phases of development at Cambourne North and future East West Rail station.

## Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

4.75 Comments largely focused on the potential for expansion of Cambourne, and are therefore responded to in the policy above.

## Further work and next steps

4.76 Further work undertaken exploring the future potential of Cambourne will also need to consider the relationship with the existing development to ensure a comprehensive approach to the settlement.

## S/GF: Grange Farm

### Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to

4.77 Through consideration of alternative sites available to address development needs a new settlement south east of Cambridge has been identified, which provides the opportunity to deliver new homes within cycling and walking distance of jobs at Granta Park and Babraham Research Campus, and connected via a proposed high quality public transport route to Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

### How was the issue covered in the First Proposals Consultation?

4.78 This is a new site proposal which was not included in the First Proposals consultation.

### Policy context update

4.79 This is a new site proposal which was not included in the First Proposals consultation.

## Summary of Main issues arising from First Proposals representations

4.80 This is a new site proposal which was not included in the First Proposals consultation.

## New or Updated Evidence

**4.81 Heritage Impact Assessment:** The HIA notes that the site is located within close proximity of several heritage assets, including the Grade II listed Worsted Lodge, Worsted Street Scheduled Ancient Monument (Roman Road) and the Great and Little Abington Conservation Area. Additionally, within the

site are burrows and the Grange Farm farmstead, which is a non-designed heritage asset. Broadly, the HIA recommends that design based mitigation is required to limit potential impacts on the local and wider skyline, townscape character of Great and Little Abington, and setting of Listed Buildings. Additionally, development should be kept in the southern portion of the site to minimise impacts on the Scheduled Monument and Worsted Lodge and their setting and extending an existing treeline. It also recommends retention of the non-designated assets and burrows and their immediate rural context. There is likely to be high potential for archaeological remains in this area and further archaeological investigation is required. At this stage, the HIA concludes that the risk of significant residual harm remains high. The mitigation measures identified through the HIA have been added to the policy.

**4.82 New Strategic Allocations Assessment: Transport Mitigation Measures (WSP, September 2025):**

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, transport mitigation requirements have been identified that support safe and suitable access for all users, that ensure sustainable modes are prioritised and that the design of internal streets reflects the National Design Guide. Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network in terms of capacity and congestion or highway safety will need to be cost effectively mitigated through a vision-led Transport Assessment process. The measures identified in the strategic allocation proformas set out those transport interventions required to support sustainable and inclusive access for each site. It is important to note that these requirements will be subject to ongoing review and change as more detailed work is undertaken.

**4.83 Cambridge South East Transport Scheme Busway Extension – Grange Farm New Community Technical Note:**

Local Plan transport modelling confirms that Grange Farm can perform in transport terms as well as other existing new settlements such as Northstowe and Waterbeach, but to do this it requires a segregated public transport route (with associated active travel facilities) to link the development site with Cambridge. Linking the site to the proposed Cambridge South East Transport Scheme (CSET) A11 travel hub and public transport corridor could address this requirement. This Technical Note builds on previous work completed as a part of earlier stage CSET investigations, to confirm that a segregated crossing between the CSET Travel Hub is technically achievable, and also identifies an up to date high level cost associated with such a scheme to inform the Local Plan infrastructure delivery plan.

**4.84 Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers (2025):**

The Accommodation Needs Assessment (ANA) of Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling

Showpeople, Bargee Travellers, and other caravan and houseboat dwellers for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (September 2024) makes a series of recommendations for meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Greater Cambridge. Each of the recommendations in terms of potential sources of supply have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Greater Cambridge. It includes recommendations for new Gypsy and Traveller sites to be provided at existing and new strategic sites.

- 4.85 **Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10c: Design of Gypsy and Traveller Sites (2025):** The Councils are proposing that strategic sites, such as new settlements and urban extensions, include sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. To inform the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within these strategic sites, it is necessary to consider: what is an appropriate number of pitches for each strategic site, and the amount of land required for different sizes of Gypsy and Traveller sites. This report sets out recommendations for the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites, based on the evidence collated, and is used to inform the anticipated delivery of Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites in Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers.
- 4.86 **Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 11: Meeting the specialist housing needs of older people and those with disabilities (2025):** Potential sources of supply to meet the identified accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities, taking account of the development strategy, have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the specialist accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities. It includes recommendations for a proportion of new homes at existing and new strategic sites to be provided as specialist accommodation, particularly for older people or those with disabilities.
- 4.87 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are very small areas of the site at low, medium or high risk of surface water flooding relative to the size of the site. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur across the whole site, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Given the size of the site, it is likely that built development can be situated outside of areas of high flood risk using a sequential approach to the site's design. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be

required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

**4.88 Additional submissions by the site promoter:** The site promoter has been developing further evidence to demonstrate the deliverability of the site since the Call for Sites submission:

- Deliverability Paper
- Ecological Study
- Foul Water Strategy Study
- Heritage Appraisal
- Landscape Technical Note
- Transport Position Paper

**4.89 Consideration of site capacity:** The capacity of the site has been informed by the information provided through the Call for Sites and informed by wider evidence, including the Heritage Impact Assessment where relevant.

**4.90** The housing capacity of the site has been informed by local site constraints and consideration of similar sites of this scale. In order for new settlements to create a 'critical mass' of people to support new services and facilities, such as healthcare, schools and public transport, residential densities should be sufficiently high. Based on local and wider best practice, densities of around 50 and 55 dwellings per hectare was considered appropriate, with a developable area of approximately 210 hectares for the site.

**4.91** An employment capacity of 20,000 square metres for B2 (General Industrial) floorspace and Class B8 (Storage or Distribution) floorspace is based on the need to serve local logistics/last mile delivery needs for the site. Additionally, a small amount of office (Class E(g)(i) floorspace (approximately 15,000 square metres) is proposed to meet the needs generated by the development. Given the close proximity of the site to existing employment centres, such as Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park, it is not considered necessary to plan for a significant amount of new office and/or research and laboratory floorspace for the site. It is expected that employment uses would be well integrated with the form of the development and support compact, walkable neighbourhoods.

#### Additional alternative approaches considered

**4.92** No additional alternative approaches identified.

## Further information supporting draft policy approach

- 4.93 Having reviewed reasonable alternative locations (see Development Strategy topic paper section 5: Towards a development strategy: Towards a draft plan development strategy: jobs and homes, and Development Strategy topic paper Appendix 5: Review of “new” new settlement opportunities), Grange Farm is the Councils preferred new settlement location. Providing homes within the Rural Southern Cluster area of significant existing and ongoing growth in employment, will enable more people to live close to their work, in a part of South Cambridgeshire that has not seen significant housing provision in recent plans. More specifically, Grange Farm’s location is within walking or cycling distance of established employment locations at Granta Park and Babraham Research Campus, and will be connected by the Cambridge South East transport scheme - providing public transport and active travel opportunities - to Cambridge Biomedical Campus, where a very significant number of jobs will be focused.
- 4.94 As a new settlement of approximately 6,000 homes, it is expected that Grange Farm will provide for a full range of housing types and sizes, and in particular that it should provide key worker housing to support surrounding employment sites (noting the rationale for locating housing here), specialist accommodation (within use classes C2 or C3), particularly for older people or those with disabilities, and a total of 12 Gypsy and Traveller pitches as a part of the Councils’ strategy for meeting these specific accommodation needs.
- 4.95 The key benefit for locating Grange Farm is that it is close to existing centres of employment, and connected by sustainable means to others. Given this fact, and that for office and R&D (E(g)) space, committed floorspace supply exceeds the updated assessed needs for the plan period, and that Grange Farm is not located in a priority location for meeting industrial and warehousing needs, the Councils have not identified this new settlement as meeting a very substantial proportion of Greater Cambridge’s employment development needs. Approximately 20,000 square metres of B2 Industrial floorspace and Class B8 (Storage or Distribution) space is expected to meet the local area’s population needs (primarily those arising from Grange Farm itself but also from surrounding villages) through provision of general industrial space and a local last mile logistics hub. A small amount of office space, approximately 15,000 square metres, is also proposed to meet local needs that are generated by the development.
- 4.96 The north eastern boundary of Grange Farm new community allocation is directly adjacent to Worsted Road Roman Road that is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) and Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI). The SSSI is identified as being of unfavourable recovering condition. As such Grange

Farm falls within the Impact Risk Zone for this SSSI. Further to this there is remnant lowland calcareous grassland of high floristic diversity within the northern boundary of the development, and non-statutory designations such as local wildlife sites within 2km of the development. To protect the SAM and SSSI from further disturbance the policy requires that appropriate measures are implemented to minimise recreational disturbance and pressures on ecology, including ensuring there is no direct access from the new town to the Worsted Road Roman Road; providing a significant gap between built development and the SSSI, providing significant green infrastructure on site to meet recreational needs, and providing ecological enhancements within the allocation.

- 4.97 Providing a significant area of undeveloped space within the Grange Farm allocation will also form part of the approach to ensuring that development here responds to the local landscape, townscape and heritage sensitivities, including maintaining a distinction between Grange Farm and surrounding existing settlements including Little Abington and Babraham, and mitigating impacts on the Grade II listed Worsted Lodge Farmhouse immediately adjacent to the north-east boundary and the nearby Conservation Area of Great Abington.
- 4.98 Ahead of the Proposed Submission stage the Councils will develop work on biodiversity protection and enhancement at this site, including the relationship with green infrastructure provision, noting for example that there are further opportunities for green infrastructure here to connect towards the North West, as a part of the Strategic Green Infrastructure Initiative: Gog Magogs and Chalkland Fringe.
- 4.99 As a new strategic development, Grange Farm will need to implement a monitored and enforceable peak-hour trip budget, in order to ensure that the impacts on the surrounding road network are limited. An indicative trip budget for this site will be agreed in due course. The key transport infrastructure required to enable Grange Farm to support a good proportion of trips by non-car modes (and thereby help meet the trip budget) is a segregated public transport and active travel link to the proposed CSET Travel Hub for the proposed CSET busway. This should support easy public transport and active travel connections to central Cambridge, Babraham, the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Granta Park. The New Strategic Allocations Assessment: Transport Mitigation Measures (WSP, September 2025) identifies further initial transport measures the site will need to deliver. Ahead of the Proposed Submission stage further work will be required to refine the transport package associated with this site, including refining proposed site accesses.

## Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

4.100 This is a new site proposal which was not included in the First Proposals consultation.

### Further work and next steps

4.101 Additional transport work will need to be undertaken to fully consider and explore the necessary mitigation measures required to allocate the site ahead of the Regulation 19 consultation. This will need to be informed by engagement with the relevant highways and transport stakeholders including National Highways.

4.102 Further work in relation to heritage and landscape impacts may also be required to better understand the existing known and unknown assets in and around the site and identification of necessary mitigation measures where required. This may result in amendments to the developable area of the site, the extent of the Strategic Enhancement Area and the draft Spatial Framework.

## 5. Existing New Settlements

Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to

- 5.1 To provide policy guidance for the three new settlements of Northstowe, the new town north of Waterbeach, and Bourn Airfield new village while they are still being developed.

How was the issue covered in the First Proposals Consultation?

- 5.2 The proposed approach set out in the First Proposals Plan was as follows:

The Local Plan will carry forward the existing allocations for the following new settlements in the 2018 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: SS/5 Northstowe SS/6 Land north of Waterbeach SS/7 Bourn Airfield.

- 5.3 The detailed policy wording would be reviewed as may be appropriate in the new local plan. The Northstowe Area Action Plan will remain part of the development plan, although standards adopted in the new Local Plan will apply to future applications. The Supplementary Planning Documents for Land north of Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield will be carried forward.

- 5.4 The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [Policy S/NS: Existing new settlements](#)

- 5.5 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: [Strategy Topic Paper](#)

Policy context update

- 5.6 The three existing new settlement sites now all have planning permission. Further details are provided in the individual site sections of this topic paper.

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

- 5.7 Issues raised in the representations include:
- Broad support for new settlements, while noting the need to ensure that they provide the necessary services, facilities, public transport and other infrastructure.
  - Some site promoters highlighted the limited contribution from new settlements within the first five years of the plan period, and the need for

more small and medium sized sites to be allocated to deliver within this period.

- Cambridge Past, Present & Future suggest that all new settlements need to deliver the same role as identified for Cambourne – well connected, town for the twenty-first century, employment areas, and a place that meets day-to-day needs.
- Campaign to Protect Rural England highlight need for various issues with existing new settlements to be resolved before further permissions are approved.

## New or Updated Evidence base

5.8 None.

## Additional alternative approaches considered

5.9 The allocations are carried forward from the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. The sites now have outline planning permission and responds positively to the First Proposals representations. An alternative policy approach would not be reasonable in these circumstances.

## Draft policy and reasons

5.10 The draft policies can be viewed in the Draft Local Plan: *Link will be added when draft plan is published.*

5.11 The draft Local Plan includes policies for each of the existing new settlements to ensure they have a robust policy framework in place for considering future planning applications.

5.12 A change from the approach proposed in the First Proposals is that it is now proposed that the new local plan policy would replace the Northstowe Area Action Plan 2007 rather than it remaining live alongside the local plan. This will provide a clearer policy framework given the age of the area action plan and the amount of change that has taken place.

## Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

5.13 Support for the new settlements approach in the First Proposals is noted.

5.14 Some representors propose alternative strategies and question the approach to new settlements, and question delivery rates in the early part of the plan

period. Appropriate delivery rates have been included in the housing trajectory, informed by discussions with developer sand the Housing Delivery Study.

- 5.15 Representors raise the importance of infrastructure delivery to meet the needs of new settlements and deliver a high quality that addresses environmental and social issues. The policies of the local plan seek to ensure that these issues are addressed.

## **S/NS: Northstowe**

### Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to

- 5.16 The carrying forward of this existing allocation continues to contribute towards the identified housing need and demand for additional employment land in the Greater Cambridge area.

### Policy context update

- 5.17 Northstowe was first allocated as a new town in the 2003 Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan. The site was then brought forward as a new settlement in the Northstowe Area Action Plan 2007 (AAP). The reserved land referred to in the AAP has subsequently been allocated as Policy SS/5 Northstowe Extension in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. The emerging Plan rolls forward the allocation of the new town and extension land and reflects the slight increase in housing numbers resulting from the outline planning permissions granted since the 2007 and 2018 Plans. This will provide a clearer policy framework given the age of the AAP and the amount of change that has since taken place. The updated NPPF December 2024 continues to provide a positive policy context for the new town. The Northstowe site supports criteria set out under “Identifying land for homes” in section 5 as a large number of homes achieved as a new settlement, well located and designed and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities.

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

- 5.18 Issues raised in the representations include:
- A number of comments highlighted that we should focus on completing the existing new settlements.
  - There were some proposals for further new settlements.

- concern about the lack of democratic involvement in the planning process for and environmental impacts.
- concern about the impact on neighbouring villages of potential increased densities around transport hubs.
- Concern about ongoing flood risk management options to reduce the risk of flooding at Oakington.
- Need to ensure that faster delivery does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas, market absorption, and tenure diversity, and also question whether infrastructure can be delivered at the faster pace.
- Environment Agency highlight continued investigation of flood risk management options to reduce risk of flooding in Oakington.

5.19 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement (September 2025).

#### New or Updated Evidence base

5.20 **Planning permission:** Six outline planning permissions have now been granted that cover the allocated Northstowe site including the extension (reserved) land. Some subsequent reserved matters applications have also been granted and construction commenced on site. The outline planning permissions are listed below and the total number of dwellings approved is 10,187 (gross) delivering 10,186 (net). For the purposes of the policy, this is rounded to 10,180 dwellings.

5.21 A Development Framework Document has been agreed which provides a masterplan for the new town. Listed below are some of the major applications permitted for this site:

5.22 **S/0388/12/OL (Phase 1):** Outline planning application for phase 1 of Northstowe comprising up to 1500 dwellings a primary school a mixed-use local centre (including a community building and provision for non-residential institutions financial and professional services shops cafes and restaurants drinking establishments and hot food take-aways) leisure community residential institutions cultural health and employment provision (business general industry and storage & distribution) including a household recycling centre formal and informal recreational space and landscaped areas and infrastructure works including site re-profiling and associated drainage works foul and surface water pumping stations two flood attenuation ponds on land east of Hattons Road and associated works including the demolition of existing buildings and structures. Permission granted 22 April 2014

- 5.23 **S/2011/14/OL (Phase 2):** Development of Phase 2 of Northstowe with details of appearance landscaping layout scale and access reserved (save for the matters submitted in respect of the Southern Access Road (West)) comprising: .1) development of the main Phase 2 development area for up to 3500 dwellings two primary schools secondary school town centre including employment uses formal and informal recreational space and landscaped areas eastern sports hub remainder of the western sports hub (to complete the provision delivered at Phase 1) busway a primary road to link to the southern access construction haul route engineering and infrastructure works and.2) construction of a highway link (Southern Access Road (West)) between the proposed new town of Northstowe and the B1050 improvements to the B1050 and associated landscaping and drainage. Permission granted 9 January 2017
- 5.24 **20/02171/OUT (Phase 3A):** Outline planning application for the development of Northstowe Phase 3A for up to 4,000 homes, two primary schools, a local centre (including employment, community, retail and associated services, food and drink, community, leisure, residential uses and other accommodation), secondary mixed use zones (including employment, community, retail and associated services, food and drink, community, leisure, residential uses), open space and landscaped areas, sports pitches, associated engineering and infrastructure works, including the retention of the existing military lake and creation of a new lake, with details of appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access reserved. Application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement and involves works to/affecting existing Public Rights of Way. Permission granted 25 March 2022
- 5.25 **20/02142/OUT (Phase 3B):** Outline planning application for the development of Northstowe Phase 3B, comprising up to 1,000 homes, a primary school, secondary mixed use zone (with retail and associated services, food and drink, community, leisure, employment and residential uses), open space and landscaped areas, engineering and infrastructure works, with details of appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access reserved. Application accompanied by an Environmental Statement. Permission granted 25 March 2022
- 5.26 **Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers (2025):** The Accommodation Needs Assessment (ANA) of Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Showpeople, Bargee Travellers, and other caravan and houseboat dwellers for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (September 2024) makes a series of recommendations for meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in

Greater Cambridge. Each of the recommendations in terms of potential sources of supply have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Greater Cambridge. It includes recommendations for new Gypsy and Traveller sites to be provided at existing and new strategic sites.

**5.27 Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10c: Design of Gypsy and Traveller Sites (2025):** The Councils are proposing that strategic sites, such as new settlements and urban extensions, include sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. To inform the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within these strategic sites, it is necessary to consider: what is an appropriate number of pitches for each strategic site, and the amount of land required for different sizes of Gypsy and Traveller sites. This report sets out recommendations for the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites, based on the evidence collated, and is used to inform the anticipated delivery of Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites in Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers.

**5.28 Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 11: Meeting the specialist housing needs of older people and those with disabilities (2025):** Potential sources of supply to meet the identified accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities, taking account of the development strategy, have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the specialist accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities. It includes recommendations for a proportion of new homes at existing and new strategic sites to be provided as specialist accommodation, particularly for older people or those with disabilities.

**5.29 Consideration of site capacity:** The site capacity has been informed by current designation in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and by the planning history for the site.

#### [Further information supporting draft policy approach](#)

**5.30** Northstowe is an important location for meeting the long-term housing needs of the Greater Cambridge area including those for specific groups such as older people, those with disabilities and travellers. This policy is required to enable the continued development of the site as a comprehensive new town. It supersedes the Northstowe Area Action Plan 2007 and Policy SS/5: Northstowe Extension of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, whilst continuing their overall aspirations.

- 5.31 It sets out clear expectations for placemaking and the elements needed to achieve this to a high standard. Respect for the existing context of the site is needed to achieve successful integration, this includes surrounding villages, their context and the Fens landscape. Expectations to enable movement around the new town, linking nearby villages and beyond to Cambridge, without overburdening the existing network and in a sustainable way, are laid out.
- 5.32 Mitigation is included within S106 Agreements relating to the six outline permissions, however, clear up to date policy guidance is necessary for any amended or further applications required.

### Reasons for draft policy approach

- 5.33 A policy for the continued allocation of this site for a new settlement is required to ensure that development opportunities and challenges are identified and responded to in a comprehensive manner.

### Additional alternative approaches considered

- 5.34 The allocation is carried forward from the Northstowe Area Action Plan 2007 and from the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. It is a continuation of the new settlement which is now under construction and responds positively to the First Proposals representations. An alternative policy approach would not be reasonable in these circumstances.

### Response to issues raised in representations

- 5.35 Responses to issues raised in representations included:
- Comments highlighted that we should focus on completing the existing new settlements. – Policies aim to support continued development of the site, but other sites also need to be allocated in addition to ensure development needs can be met.
  - There were some proposals for further new settlements – these have been tested and considered, see the strategy topic paper.
  - Need to ensure that faster delivery does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas, market absorption, and tenure diversity, and also question whether infrastructure can be delivered at the faster pace. Some site promoters' question the evidence for increased delivery rates and how these increased rates will be achieved. – delivery rates are considered robust based on evidence in the Housing Delivery Study.

- Historic England highlight a need to consider heritage assets – the draft policy continues to reference important heritage assets that need to be protected.
- Concern about impact on surrounding villages and the provision of infrastructure. The policy makes provision to minimise impacts on nearby settlements and to phase delivery to enable services and infrastructure to be provided to meet the needs of the development as it grows. The policy also provides for highway and traffic mitigation resulting from the development on a manage and monitor basis.
- Concern about floor risk management - Site wide strategic flood mitigation is being provided taking into account the villages of Oakington and Longstanton.
- Concern about the lack of public involvement in the planning process – this is provided for statutorily.

## **Policy S/WNT Waterbeach New Town**

### **Policy context update**

- 5.36 The site was allocated as a new settlement in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 under Policy SS/6: Waterbeach New Town. The emerging Plan reflects the increase in housing numbers resulting from the outline planning permissions granted since the 2018 Local Plan.
- 5.37 The updated NPPF December 2024 continues to provide a positive policy context for the new town. The Waterbeach site supports criteria set out under “Identifying land for homes” in section 5 as a large number of homes achieved as a new settlement, well located and designed and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities.

### **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

- 5.38 Issues raised in the representations include:
- A number of comments highlighted that we should focus on completing the existing new settlements.
  - There were some proposals for further new settlements.
  - Need to ensure that faster delivery does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas, market absorption, and tenure diversity, and also question whether infrastructure can be delivered at the faster pace. Some site promoters’ question the evidence for increased delivery rates and how these increased rates will be achieved.
  - Historic England highlight need to consider heritage assets

- Waterbeach PC highlight need to consider the Neighbourhood Plan and infrastructure issues that still need to be resolved
- Other comments highlight transport implications from this development.

5.39 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement (September 2025).

### New or Updated Evidence base

5.40 **Planning Permissions:** Two outline planning permissions have now been granted that cover the allocated Waterbeach New Town site. Some subsequent reserved matters applications has also been granted and construction commenced on site. Outline planning permission reference number S/0559/17/OL is for 6,500 new homes and outline planning permission reference number S/2075/18/OL is for 4,500 new homes. This amounts to 11,000 homes, an increase in dwellings from the proposed 8,000 to 9,000 homes in Policy SS/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

5.41 **S/0559/17/OL** - Outline Planning Application for up to 6500 dwellings (including up to 600 residential institutional units) business retail community leisure and sports uses a hotel new primary and secondary schools green open spaces including parks ecological areas and woodlands principal new accesses from the A10 and other points of access associated infrastructure groundworks and demolition with all matters reserved except for the first primary junction from the A10 and construction access from Denny End Road. Permission granted 27<sup>th</sup> September 2019

5.42 **S/2075/18/OL** - Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) for development of up to 4500 dwellings business retail community leisure and sports uses new primary and secondary schools and sixth form centre public open spaces including parks and ecological areas points of access associated drainage and other infrastructure groundworks landscaping and highways works. Permission granted 17<sup>th</sup> December 2024

5.43 **21/02400/REM** - Reserved matters application for 89 dwellings, for appearance, means of access, landscaping, layout and scale, pursuant to condition 3 of the outline planning permission S/0559/17/OL. Permission granted 30<sup>th</sup> July 2021

5.44 **21/03866/REM** - Reserved matters (appearance, access, landscaping, layout and scale) planning application pursuant to condition 3 of the outline planning

permission ref: S/0559/17/OL for the construction of 111 new dwellings and associated development. Permission granted 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2021

- 5.45 **S/3854/19/OL** - Outline Planning Application for residential development of up to 80 dwellings and associated infrastructure (considering access only) following demolition of existing buildings. Permission granted 11<sup>th</sup> July 2023
- 5.46 **20/03598/OUT** - Outline Planning with all matters reserved, except for the vehicular accesses onto Station Road, for the demolition of a single dwelling and associated buildings and development of up to 107 dwellings (including affordable housing) and employment/ community/ cafe/ development together with parking areas, landscaping and all associated infrastructure. Permission granted 11<sup>th</sup> July 2022
- 5.47 Permissions have been granted for various elements of infrastructure.
- 5.48 **Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers (2025):** The Accommodation Needs Assessment (ANA) of Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Showpeople, Bargee Travellers, and other caravan and houseboat dwellers for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (September 2024) makes a series of recommendations for meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Greater Cambridge. Each of the recommendations in terms of potential sources of supply have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Greater Cambridge. It includes recommendations for new Gypsy and Traveller sites to be provided at existing and new strategic sites.
- 5.49 **Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10c: Design of Gypsy and Traveller Sites (2025):** The Councils are proposing that strategic sites, such as new settlements and urban extensions, include sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. To inform the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within these strategic sites, it is necessary to consider: what is an appropriate number of pitches for each strategic site, and the amount of land required for different sizes of Gypsy and Traveller sites. This report sets out recommendations for the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites, based on the evidence collated, and is used to inform the anticipated delivery of Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites in Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers.

5.50 **Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 11: Meeting the specialist housing needs of older people and those with disabilities (2025):** Potential sources of supply to meet the identified accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities, taking account of the development strategy, have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the specialist accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities. It includes recommendations for a proportion of new homes at existing and new strategic sites to be provided as specialist accommodation, particularly for older people or those with disabilities.

5.51 **Further consideration of capacity:** The site capacity has been informed by previous designation in the Local Plan and by the approved outline planning application S/2075/18/OL is for the first parcel of land is for 22,400sqm B1a and 2,400sqm for B1c/B8, and for S/2075/18/OL the second parcel of land this proposes 15,000sqm GEA floorspace of B1a, b and c. This figure has been converted to GIA. In total for the two parcels this equates to 39,800 sqm of employment floorspace. The housing capacity is informed by the two permissions which up to 6,500 homes and up to 4,500 homes which has been added together to approximately 11,000 homes.

#### Further information supporting draft policy approach

5.52 Waterbeach New Town is an important location for meeting the long-term housing needs, delivering a sustainable new settlement and a distinctive place that can serve the needs of the strong local economy as well as set a high standard in terms of quality, lifestyle and identity.

5.53 This policy is required to enable the continued development of the site as a comprehensive new town, and provide a framework for consideration of future planning applications. The policy sets out clear expectations for placemaking and the elements needed to achieve this to a high standard. Respect for the existing context of the site is needed to achieve successful integration, this includes with the Fens landscape, historic Denny Abbey and the existing Waterbeach village. Expectations to enable movement around the new town and beyond such as nearby Cambridge, without overburdening the existing network and in a sustainable way, are laid out.

5.54 The policy updates housing mix requirements based on the latest information, and future applications will need to respond to these needs.

## Response to issues raised in representations

5.55 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Comments highlighted that we should focus on completing the existing new settlements. – Policies aim to support continued development of the site, but other sites also need to be allocated in addition to ensure development needs can be met.
- There were some proposals for further new settlements – these have been tested and considered, see the strategy topic paper.
- Need to ensure that faster delivery does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas, market absorption, and tenure diversity, and also question whether infrastructure can be delivered at the faster pace. Some site promoters' question the evidence for increased delivery rates and how these increased rates will be achieved. – delivery rates are considered robust based on evidence in the Housing Delivery Study.
- Historic England highlight need to consider heritage assets – the draft policy continues to reference important heritage assets that need to be protected.
- Waterbeach PC highlight need to consider the Neighbourhood Plan and infrastructure issues that still need to be resolved – The Neighbourhood Plan has been 'made', and forms part of the development plan.
- Other comments highlight transport implications from this development. – significant transport infrastructure is needed to support the ongoing development of the site. This includes relocation of the railway station which is planned.

## Reasons for draft policy approach

5.56 A policy for the continued allocation of this site for a new settlement is required to ensure that development opportunities and challenges are identified and responded to in a comprehensive manner.

## Additional alternative approaches considered

5.57 The allocation is carried forward from the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. It is a continuation of the new settlement which is now under construction and responds positively to the First Proposals representations. An alternative policy approach would not be reasonable in these circumstances.

## Policy S/BA: Bourn Airfield New Village

### Policy context update

5.58 The site was allocated as a new settlement in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 under Policy SS/7: Bourn Airfield New Village.

5.59 The updated NPPF December 2024 continues to provide a positive policy context for the new village. The Bourn Airfield site supports criteria set out under “Identifying land for homes” in section 5 as a large number of homes achieved as a new settlement, well located and designed and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities.

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

5.60 Issues raised in the representations include:

- A number of comments highlighted that we should focus on completing the existing new settlements.
- There were some proposals for further new settlements.
- Landowner of the employment area highlights that development needs to be compatible with existing industrial uses, and
- Site promoter highlights that there is potential for higher annual delivery rates.
- Other site promoters’ comments highlight transport and infrastructure requirements for this development as being threats to delivery.
- Cambourne TC comment that transport links for this development should be considered in line with Cambourne and West Cambourne.
- Historic England highlight need to consider heritage assets.

5.61 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement (date).

### New or Updated Evidence base

5.62 **Planning Permission:** Outline planning permission granted 30 July 2024 for a new mixed use village comprising residential development of approximately 3500 dwellings mixed uses comprising employment retail hotel leisure residential institutions education community facilities open space including parks ecological areas and woodlands landscaping engineering for foul and sustainable urban drainage systems footpaths cycle ways public transport infrastructure highways including a principal eastern access from the roundabout on St Neots Road and western access with Broadway including first section of strategic public transport route associated infrastructure

groundworks and demolition with all matters reserved except for the principal highway junctions from the St Neots Road roundabout and onto Broadway with some matters reserved except for access. This application is subject to an Environmental impact assessment.

- 5.63 Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers (2025):** The Accommodation Needs Assessment (ANA) of Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Showpeople, Bargee Travellers, and other caravan and houseboat dwellers for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (September 2024) makes a series of recommendations for meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Greater Cambridge. Each of the recommendations in terms of potential sources of supply have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Greater Cambridge. It includes recommendations for new Gypsy and Traveller sites to be provided at existing and new strategic sites.
- 5.64 Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10c: Design of Gypsy and Traveller Sites (2025):** The Councils are proposing that strategic sites, such as new settlements and urban extensions, include sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. To inform the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within these strategic sites, it is necessary to consider: what is an appropriate number of pitches for each strategic site, and the amount of land required for different sizes of Gypsy and Traveller sites. This report sets out recommendations for the requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites, based on the evidence collated, and is used to inform the anticipated delivery of Gypsy and Traveller sites within strategic sites in Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 10a: Meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers.
- 5.65 Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 11: Meeting the specialist housing needs of older people and those with disabilities (2025):** Potential sources of supply to meet the identified accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities, taking account of the development strategy, have been considered by the Councils, and this report sets out how each potential source of supply will contribute towards meeting the specialist accommodation needs of older people and those with disabilities. It includes recommendations for a proportion of new homes at existing and new strategic sites to be provided as specialist accommodation, particularly for older people or those with disabilities.

5.66 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The site capacity has been informed by previous designation in the Local Plan and by the outline planning application (S/3440/18/OL). The outline permission is for 3,500 homes and 1,394 sqm of Eg / B1 floorspace. The Bourn Airfield New Village SPD has also informed the capacity of the site. The Bourn Airfield New Village SPD has also informed the capacity of the site.

### Further information supporting draft policy approach

5.67 Following the allocation of the site as a new village in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, outline planning permission has been granted for 3,500 new homes and associated uses, including for employment. This policy is required to enable the continued allocation and development of the site as a comprehensive new village.

5.68 It sets out clear expectations for placemaking and the elements needed to achieve this to a high standard. Respect for the existing context of the site is needed to achieve successful integration, this includes with the surrounding villages, the town of Cambourne and the rural area within which it sits. Expectations to enable movement around the new village and beyond, especially nearby Cambridge, without overburdening the existing network and in a sustainable way, are laid out.

5.69 The policy updates housing mix requirements based on the latest information, and future applications will need to respond to these needs.

### Response to issues raised in representations

5.70 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Comments highlighted that we should focus on completing the existing new settlements – Policies aim to support continued development of the site, but other sites also need to be allocated in addition to ensure development needs can be met.
- There were some proposals for further new settlements – these have been tested and considered, see the strategy topic paper.
- Landowner of the employment area highlights that development needs to be compatible with existing industrial uses – the relationship with the employment sites adjoining the new settlement was considered through the planning application process and will be considered in any future applications.
- Site promoter highlights that there is potential for higher annual delivery rates – delivery rates used in the housing trajectory have been informed by our Housing Delivery study to ensure they are robust.

- Other site promoters' comments highlight transport and infrastructure requirements for this development as being threats to delivery – Infrastructure needed to support the site has been identified and agreed through the Section 106 process as part of the planning application. Plans for transport improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge are progressing.
- Cambourne TC comment that transport links for this development should be considered in line with Cambourne and West Cambourne.
- Historic England highlight need to consider heritage assets – the draft policy continues to reference important heritage assets that need to be protected.

### Reasons for draft policy approach

5.71 A policy for the continued allocation of this site for a new settlement is required to ensure that development opportunities and challenges are identified and responded to in a comprehensive manner.

### Additional alternative approaches considered

5.72 The allocation is carried forward from the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. It is a continuation of the new settlement which is now under construction and responds positively to the First Proposals representations. An alternative policy approach would not be reasonable in these circumstances.

## 6. The Rural Southern Cluster

6.1 This chapter provides a background summary of the evidence and representations received from earlier stages of consultation on the sites within the Rural Southern Cluster.

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

6.2 Issues raised in the representations include:

#### Proposed approach to development in the Rural Southern Cluster:

- support for the clustering of development in the Rural Southern Cluster, however:
  - need to protect villages from disproportionate levels of development, as this will have impacts on village character, historic assets, landscape character, and wildlife habitats,
  - scale of proposals is inadequate and does not take account of economic potential of the area,
  - further Green Belt release is necessary to ensure vitality of rural areas,
  - should prioritise sites within public transport corridors,
  - should take account of small sites included in Neighbourhood Plans,
  - concerns over traffic congestion, inappropriate infrastructure, lack of water supply, and effects on landscape and floodplains,
  - there are other public transport and employment clusters within the area that should also be considered, for example around Melbourn,
  - need to consider cumulative effects and impacts of the level of development proposed in this area, particularly on transport, landscape, agricultural land, and existing settlements,
  - provision of infrastructure for these new developments should be a priority,
  - needs to include truly affordable housing,
  - needs to include provision of health services and facilities, and
  - site allocations need to include clear requirements for well-designed places that promote healthy lifestyles.

### **Site specific comments:**

- Granta Park and the Welding Institute should be referred to given their importance to the area.

### **Rejected sites:**

- support for the rejection of specific sites, and
- requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

6.3 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement.

## **Response to issues raised in representations**

6.4 Some comments seek further development, that the plan should have allocated more sites, and released further green belt. Many of the comments here reflect comments and issues addressed when considering the strategy section of the draft plan. Other comments reflect concerns about the level of development. The draft local plan has been informed by a range of evidence to identify development needs and select the sites to meet that need. This includes consideration of infrastructure needs, and how the needs generated by new development will be met.

## **Policy S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxtton**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

6.5 To help meet the need for housing and employment land by identifying specific land allocations for development in the Rural Southern Cluster.

6.6 HIA Assessment: The HIA recommends that development of the eastern field parcels within the allocation site has potential to impact on Hinxtton Conservation Area as open views to the east exist at various 8 points within the conservation area. Design mitigation in terms of limiting building height, mass and grouping together with landscape buffers and tree planting will assist in the reduction of impacts. Archaeological investigation of the site may be required. Residual risk is considered to be moderate.

## Policy context update

6.7 National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2024.

## Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

6.8 Issues raised in the representations include:

- The development needs to respect Hinxton's rural location and history.
- Concern that the development will not deliver suitable affordable housing.
- Consideration should be given at an early stage to civic governance, particularly whether a separate parish council is required.
- The policy should mention the importance of considering historic environment impacts as part of any future proposals.

## New or Updated Evidence base

6.9 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that development of the eastern field parcels within the allocation site has potential to impact on Hinxton Conservation Area as open views to the east exist at various points within the conservation area. Design mitigation in terms of limiting building height, mass and grouping together with landscape buffers and tree planting will assist in the reduction of impacts. Archaeological investigation of the site will be required. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

6.10 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that although large areas of the site have planning permission, part of the site is situated within Flood Zone 3 (1%) and adjacent to Flood Zone 2 – this increases slightly when taking account of the potential impacts of climate change (without flood defences). Given the size of the site, it is likely that built development can be situated outside of areas of high flood risk using a sequential approach to the site's design. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

6.11 **Planning Permission:** In 2020, an outline planning permission (S/4329/18/OL) was granted for up 150,000 square metres gross external area of floorspace for flexible employment uses, 1,500 residential dwellings,

and an assortment of leisure, social and infrastructure buildings. Development requirements have been added to the policy.

**6.12 Further consideration of site capacity:** The capacity of the site is based on the outline planning permission (S/4329/18/OL), which has approved 127,500 square metres gross internal floor area of employment floorspace.

### Further information supporting draft policy approach

6.13 The Genome Campus, Hinxton is set within and adjacent to the estate of Hinxton Hall on 125-acres of landscaped parkland bordering the River Cam. The Campus is the world's leading centre for genomics research, having played a central role in the Human Genome Project (1990-2003), which read and recorded the complete sequence of DNA in an individual for the first time.

6.14 In 2020 South Cambridgeshire District Council granted planning permission for a mixed-use development which would provide a further 150,000 square metres of new research and translation floorspace. Translation research is aimed at translating (converting) research in into results that directly benefit humans. It estimates that around 4,300 new jobs will be created by the expansion of the campus. The jobs will be accompanied by 1,500 new homes specifically for Campus workers, along with a new school, a nursery and community facilities, and public open spaces and allotments.

6.15 There are opportunities for redevelopment on the existing campus, and to provide further unification between the old and the new site, to help make the campus a community.

### Response to issues raised in representations

6.16 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- The development needs to respect Hinxton's rural location and history. - Development requirements have been added to the policy.
- Concern that the development will not deliver suitable affordable housing. =This will be covered by other policies in the emerging Local Plan.
- Consideration should be given at an early stage to civic governance, particularly whether a separate parish council is required. - The Local Plan is not an appropriate place to address this issue.
- The policy should mention the importance of considering historic environment impacts as part of any future proposals.- A development requirement has been added to the policy.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

- 6.17 The allocation seeks to provide a policy response to the existing planning permission for the important site. Without a policy for the area, this major site would remain in the countryside policy terms, which would not be an effective policy framework for future applications.
- 6.18 An alternative policy approach would not be reasonable in these circumstances.

## **Policy S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

- 6.19 Provide a context for future development of the Babraham Research Campus.

### **Policy context update**

- 6.20 National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2024, including changes to Green Belt policy.

## **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

- 6.21 Issues raised in the representations include:
- Removing site from Green Belt will remove important planning constraints, and the site needs protection from excessive development.
  - Compensatory improvements will be required to improve environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land.
  - Proposal adds further pressure on need for housing in Babraham.
  - Proposal adversely affects setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Proposal does not consider historic importance of Babraham village. Proposal will destroy the open, rural landscape character of Babraham Hall's parkland setting.
  - Proposals could destroy important wildlife habitats, and place pressure on the River Granta.
  - Policy should require strong emphasis on biodiversity enhancement within or adjacent to the Campus.
  - Any proposals should be below tree height as viewed from the Gog Magog Hills and be blended into landscape.
  - Fails to consider important recent archaeological findings in the area.
  - Proposal is risky as it places development on floodplains.
  - Proposals places pressure on village amenities.

- Campus needs to include publicly accessible footpaths through the campus.
- Respondent perceives one of the newer buildings to have had a negative impact on Campus, therefore retroactive screening is required.
- Historic England recommend preparing a Heritage Impact Assessment and using the recommendations to inform the policy. Also recommend referencing wider offsite heritage assets and have provided specific wording for the policy.

## New or Updated Evidence base

**6.22 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** to understand the impacts of development on the historic environment, including specific assets and their setting. The HIA describes how part of the site falls within the Babraham Conservation Area. It notes that on the site, there is the Grade I Listed building St Peter's Church, and the Grade II\* Listed Babraham Hall and its gardens, and both buildings have group value. There are also a significant number of designated and non-designated historic assets situated within 500 metres of the site. The HIA notes that there is moderate potential to find archaeological remains on undeveloped areas of the site. The HIA recommends that design-based mitigation is implemented so that the legibility of the estate and the rural character of the Conservation Area are not eroded. It recommends limiting development to areas of existing development or in undeveloped land in the far north of the site and maintaining building height equal to or lower than current building heights. It also recommends excluding certain areas from development, including the gardens surrounding the Grade I Church and Grade II\* Babraham Hall. Key views looking outside the site, particularly views looking west from the hall along the avenue and east from the Hall are recommended to be kept clear of development, and existing tree coverage should be retained. The HIA recommends retaining the Lodge building as it contributes to the wider setting and historic value of Babraham Hall. The HIA also recommends carrying out archaeological investigation, and further mitigation actions, including avoidance and preservation in situ, may also be necessary. Development requirements have been added to the policy.

**6.23 Updated Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) for site 51604:** The overall rating for the assessment has not changed. However, the rating for transport and roads has been downgraded to amber because the site needs to provide high quality local non-motorised routes linking to Cambridge South East Transport and Cambridge. Development requirements have been added to the policy.

**6.24 New Strategic Allocations Assessment: Transport Mitigation Measures (WSP, September 2025):** In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, transport mitigation requirements have been identified that

support safe and suitable access for all users, that ensure sustainable modes are prioritised and that the design of internal streets reflects the National Design Guide. Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network in terms of capacity and congestion or highway safety will need to be cost effectively mitigated through a vision-led Transport Assessment process. The measures identified in the strategic allocation proformas set out those transport interventions required to support sustainable and inclusive access for each site. It is important to note that these requirements will be subject to ongoing review and change as more detailed work is undertaken.

6.25 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that areas of the site are situated within Flood Zone 3 (5%) and Flood Zone 2 (6%), and this risk of fluvial flooding increases slightly with climate change (without flood defences), particularly for Flood Zone 2 (to 13%). A small proportion of the site is in an area that has historically flooded. There are notable risks of reservoir flooding during both wet-day and dry-day scenarios. There is also potential for groundwater flooding to occur at below-ground level and surface level for some of the site. The site's sloping topography and the low-lying nature of the River Granta may affect the possibility of flooding in real terms. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a medium risk of flooding, and the site-specific flood risks and opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

6.26 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The site capacity had been informed by consideration of information from the promoter through the call for sites as well as further evidence undertaken including the HIA. The capacity also reflects the planning permission on part of the site and the typical plot ratios which are suitable and achievable on campus sites in this area. Residential capacity has been based on a broad density of approximately 40 dwellings per hectare. However, further site specific work would be required at the planning application stage to determine the most appropriate quantum of development based on the constraints identified in the policy and supporting evidence.

### **Further information supporting draft policy approach**

6.27 The Babraham Research Campus is one of the UK's leading centres for bioscience innovation and lies within the countryside and Green Belt to the south-east of Cambridge and on the north-west side of the village of

Babraham. The Campus comprises a range of research and development buildings located on the north-west and south-east side of Babraham Hall, a 19<sup>th</sup> century Grade II Listed Building situated within a 182 hectare parkland setting.

- 6.28 National planning policy is clear that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where there are exceptional circumstances, where this is fully evidenced and justified through the preparation or updating of plans. Allocation of land in this location responds to need identified in the Greater Cambridge Employment Land Review and Economic Development Evidence Base (2020) and the Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study: Life science and ICT locational, land and accommodation needs (2024), in a location best able to respond to the specific needs of the life sciences cluster. The Campus has a distinct and unique set of characteristics, not available anywhere else at other research facilities in the sub-region and has benefited from significant public investment. The campus is important to the development of UK life sciences, in particular supporting start-up and scale-up bioscience companies.
- 6.29 The Cambridge Green Belt Study (2021) identifies that the Campus makes a relatively limited contribution to Green Belt purposes, and the harm of its release would be low. The study highlights that harm could be ameliorated by the enhancement of existing hedgerows and woodland that forms the boundaries of the site, particularly to the east and west. This would also help ensure that development enhances existing landscape features, including parkland features, and is in keeping with the wider wooded character.

## **Response to issues raised in representations**

- 6.30 Responses to issues raised in representations include:
- Removing site from Green Belt will remove important planning constraints, and the site needs protection from excessive development.- The Cambridge Green Belt Study (2021) identifies that the Campus makes a relatively limited contribution to Green Belt purposes, and the harm of its release would be low. The study highlights that harm could be ameliorated by the enhancement of existing hedgerows and woodland that forms the boundaries of the site, particularly to the east and west. Development requirements have been added to the policy which request that any future development proposals deliver a Green Belt enhancement strategy.
  - Compensatory improvements will be required to improve environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land. - Compensatory improvements have been added as a development requirement into the policy. Support for continued growth of nationally important research

campus meeting evidenced needs for additional space, provides justification for the exceptional circumstances required to release this land from the Green Belt, including providing policy support for key worker housing in this location.

- Proposal adds further pressure on need for housing in Babraham. - Residential properties are being delivered as part of the proposal which should help to address housing need.
- Proposal adversely affects setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Proposal does not consider historic importance of Babraham village. Proposal will destroy the open, rural landscape character of Babraham Hall's parkland setting. - Development requirements have been added to the policy addressing heritage issues which will ensure that future proposals sensitively protect existing heritage assets, the wider rural landscape and character of Babraham.
- Proposals could destroy important wildlife habitats, and place pressure on the River Granta. - Risks to surrounding wildlife and the River Granta can be appropriately mitigated. Development requirements requesting that future development protects the River Granta have been added to the policy.
- Policy should require strong emphasis on biodiversity enhancement within or adjacent to the Campus. Development requirements have been added to the policy.
- Any proposals should be below tree height as viewed from the Gog Magog Hills and be blended into landscape. Development requirements relating to protecting views on the site have been added to the policy.
- Fails to consider important recent archaeological findings in the area. - A development requirement has been added to the policy asking for archaeological work to take place before development can take place.
- Proposal is risky as it places development on floodplains. - There are areas on the southern boundary of the site near the river that would need to be avoided by development or subject to mitigation. This would be required by policies in the draft local plan.
- Proposals places pressure on village amenities and infrastructure. - Development requirements have been added to the policy which will mean that development will improve the village's amenities and infrastructure needs.
- Campus needs to include publicly accessible footpaths through the campus. Development requirements relating to movement and making amenities accessible to the general public have been added to the policy.
- Respondent perceives one of the newer buildings to have had a negative impact on Campus, therefore retroactive screening is required. - The policy and site allocations are focussed upon new development in this area, and therefore this request cannot be met through this policy process.

- Historic England recommend preparing a Heritage Impact Assessment and using the recommendations to inform the policy. Also recommend referencing wider offsite heritage assets and have provided specific wording for the policy. - The HIA has been used to write the policy and the other recommendations have been incorporated into the policy.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

6.31 No Policy – without a policy the area would remain in the Green Belt and additional land would not be allocated for development.

## **Policy S/RSC: Other site allocations in the Rural Southern Cluster**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

6.32 To help meet the need for new housing and jobs in Greater Cambridge by identifying specific site allocations for housing or employment development in the Rural Southern Cluster.

### **Policy context update**

6.33 National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2024, including changes to green belt policy.

## **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

6.34 Issues raised in the representations include:

- **Proposed approach to site allocations in the Rural Southern Cluster:** support from some for the overall approach to site allocations in the rural southern cluster, however suggestions included:
  - objections to the release of Green Belt land,
  - need to retain character of existing villages,
  - need to consider Neighbourhood Plans,
  - support for small scale developments where there is suitable infrastructure and public transport, and
  - need more smaller developments which can deliver homes quickly.
- **Rejected sites:**
  - Support for the rejection of specific sites from individuals and a Parish Council, and requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.
- **Site specific comments:**

- **Land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford (S/RSC/HW):**
  - fails to meet the exceptional criteria for Green Belt release,
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
  - poor quality access to the site and will create congestion,
  - proximity to railway station will make homes attractive to London commuters rather than locals,
  - based on promise of transport initiatives which have not yet been approved,
  - should include requirements for public open space,
  - need Green Belt mitigation along northern and eastern boundaries,
  - will destroy flora, fauna and arable land,
  - should reduce the area of land proposed for development,
  - will contribute to the merging of Great Shelford and Stapleford and coalescence with Cambridge,
  - will affect local character and impact on long views to the rolling chalk hills,
  - would severely impact Gog Magog Hills, Wandlebury and the rural landscape,
  - existing infrastructure (e.g. water supply, schools, doctors) is already overstretched and additional development will add further pressure,
  - proposed development does not materially contribute towards the overall housing need, and
  - landowner supports the allocation.
- **Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford (S/RSC/MF):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording, and
  - site falls within Duxford's Air Safeguarding Zone and therefore consultation is necessary.
- **Comfort Café, Fourwentways (S/RSC/CC):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.
- **Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston (S/RSC/H/1(c)):**

- need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
- transport infrastructure improvements are needed,
- the green space to be provided is negligible,
- need to protect watercourses,
- housing density is inappropriate,
- needs to consider design principles for Sawston set out in guidance,
- no need for allocation as full planning application being considered,
- protect fertile soils, woodland and farmland, and
- conserve historic, rural and parkland character, and consider impacts on landscape.

6.35 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement.

6.36 Policy S/RSC identifies the list of sites that are allocated for housing or employment uses in the Rural Southern Cluster, and the specific development requirements for each site that should be met alongside all other relevant Local Plan policy requirements. It highlights that the number of homes or floorspace included in the policy is indicative and that what is permitted should be determined through a design-led approach at the planning application stage.

6.37 The Local Plan must allocate sites for new housing and employment development to meet the long term housing needs of Greater Cambridge and support the forecast new jobs in the area. The majority of new homes and jobs will be delivered at the strategic sites on the edge of Cambridge and at the new settlements. However, to take advantage of the opportunity to provide new homes and further local employment opportunities within close proximity of the existing research parks and in locations with sustainable transport opportunities, and to help support the vitality of villages and the delivery of smaller sites within the area, sites have been allocated for housing or employment development within the Rural Southern Cluster.

6.38 Within the Rural Southern Cluster, sites have been:

- focused in locations with sustainable access – considered to be Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centres, and Group villages with very good public transport access,
- acknowledging the Green Belt – though site testing we considered sites in the green belt, but determined that exceptional circumstances there was

no exceptional circumstances to meet general need in light of alternatives available,

- informed by the Greater Cambridge Employment and Housing Evidence Update (2023), Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study: Life science and ICT locational, land and accommodation needs (2024), and Greater Cambridge Industrial and Warehousing Sector Study (2025) – provides evidence on the locational demand of different sectors, and the Rural Southern Cluster can respond to the demand for start-up and grow on space in both the Life Science and ICT sectors especially given its existing life science clusters,
- accounting for existing committed development – for parishes with lots of existing committed development the aim is for the existing sites to have been built and the new communities bedded in before further development is identified, and
- considering where there is community aspirations and support for further development.

6.39 The assessment of all sites considered in the Rural Southern Cluster, including reasons for their allocation or rejection, is set out in Development Strategy Topic Paper Appendix 7: Review of sites to inform identification of allocations. The site specific reasons for the allocation of each site are set out in the draft policy and reasons section of the specific allocation in the Individual Site Allocations section. The identified specific development requirements for each of the sites are necessary to ensure that the likely impacts of the development will be adequately mitigated, and have been informed by the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, Heritage Impact Assessments and any relevant planning permission(s).

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

6.40 No additional alternative approaches identified.

## **Response to issues raised in representations**

6.41 Responses to general issues raised in representations include:

- **objections to the release of Green Belt land:** Non-strategic sites in the rural southern cluster within the Green Belt have been considered individually to determine whether there are site specific exceptional circumstances to justify their release from the Green Belt given the best served villages largely fall within the green belt. However, given the alternative sites available it is not considered that there are exceptional circumstances for green belt release.

- **need to retain character of existing villages:** a variety of sites have been considered through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) process and assessed against the development strategy for the Local Plan, and those sites identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated. In identifying whether a site is suitable, the HELAA has assessed the impact of each site on a range of issues such as landscape, townscape, biodiversity, and the historic environment. Any mitigation measures identified within the HELAA site assessment as being necessary to make the proposed development acceptable have been included as site specific development requirements.
- **need to consider Neighbourhood Plans:** the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) process has assessed each site against any spatial policies within made (adopted) Neighbourhood Plans.
- **support for small scale developments:** the settlement hierarchy categorises each village based on its sustainability taking account of public transport links, employment opportunities, and availability of services and facilities. The development strategy for the Local Plan seeks to focus growth in the most sustainable locations whilst also recognising the need to support the vitality of villages.
- **need more smaller developments:** a variety of sites across Greater Cambridge have been included as allocations in the draft Local Plan. Together with a range of sites that already have planning permission, and small windfall housing developments that will be brought forward in the future as allowed by other policies in the Local Plan, this collectively results in a diversity of sizes and types of housing sites anticipated to be delivered throughout the plan period.
- **support for the rejection of specific sites and requests for specific sites to be allocated:** new or updated evidence and representations received to the First Proposals consultation have all been considered, and those sites that continue to be identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated.

6.42 The response to issues raised in representations relating to specific sites are included in the response to issues raised in representations section of the specific allocation in the Individual Site Allocations section.

### Further information supporting draft policy approach

6.43 Policy S/RSC identifies the list of sites that are allocated for housing or employment uses in the Rural Southern Cluster, and the specific development requirements for each site that should be met alongside all other relevant Local Plan policy requirements. It highlights that the number of homes or floorspace included in the policy is indicative and that what is permitted should

be determined through a design-led approach at the planning application stage.

- 6.44 The Local Plan must allocate sites for new housing and employment development to meet the long term housing needs of Greater Cambridge and support the forecast new jobs in the area. The majority of new homes and jobs will be delivered at the strategic sites on the edge of Cambridge and at the new settlements. However, to take advantage of the opportunity to provide new homes and further local employment opportunities within close proximity of the existing research parks and in locations with sustainable transport opportunities, and to help support the vitality of villages and the delivery of smaller sites within the area, sites have been allocated for housing or employment development within the Rural Southern Cluster.
- 6.45 Within the Rural Southern Cluster, sites have been focused in locations with sustainable access – considered to be Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centres, and Group villages with very good public transport access,
- acknowledging the Green Belt – through site testing we considered sites in the Green Belt, but determined that exceptional circumstances there was no exceptional circumstances to meet general need in light of alternatives available,
  - informed by the Greater Cambridge Employment and Housing Evidence Update (2023), Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study: Life science and ICT locational, land and accommodation needs (2024), and Greater Cambridge Industrial and Warehousing Sector Study (2025) – provides evidence on the locational demand of different sectors, and the Rural Southern Cluster can respond to the demand for start-up and grow on space in both the Life Science and ICT sectors especially given its existing life science clusters,
  - accounting for existing committed development – for parishes with lots of existing committed development the aim is for the existing sites to have been built and the new communities bedded in before further development is identified, and
  - considering where there are community aspirations and support for further development.

## Individual Site Allocations

### Housing

#### S/RSC/MF: Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford

##### New or updated evidence

- 6.46 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA recommends that the implementation of a design-based mitigation approach to development of the site, primarily in the form of building height, style, and materials, should limit impacts on the setting of designated assets. The unsympathetic development of this rural village site could impact the Grade I Listed Buildings of Parish Church of St John and Parish Church of St Peter and their settings, and may impact the Grade II Listed Buildings, and the setting and character of the Duxford and Duxford Airfield Conservation Areas, separate from the site, but where any unsympathetic development height, exceeding the local prevailing building height of 2 storeys, may present moderate risk to the setting of the Listed Buildings, particularly to the southwest end of Duxford. There are also opportunities for design to enhance character and setting of heritage assets.
- 6.47 **Updated Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) for the site:** this has not changed the assessment outcome and still confirms that the site is suitable for development, deliverable and developable. No change to policy approach.
- 6.48 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are very small areas of the site at low risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur across the whole site, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 6.49 **Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and site-specific evidence has been considered and the indicative capacity of 60 homes (30 dwellings per hectare) reflects the edge of village location, wider landscape and general prevailing character of the village, and that a proportion of the site has been discounted from the developable area to account for the hedgerows, substantial landscape and tree buffers mitigation within the site boundary.

## Response to issues raised in representations

6.50 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Historic England highlighted the need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording – Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirements have been added to the policy.
- site falls within Duxford's Air Safeguarding Zone and therefore consultation is necessary - Development requirements relating to maximum building heights, and detail design, reflecting site location within IWM Duxford Air Safeguarding Zone has been added into the policy.

## S/RSC/BR: Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston

### New or updated evidence

6.51 **Planning permission:** full planning permission was approved on 25 August 2022 (21/03955/FUL) for 280 dwellings, two new vehicular accesses from Babraham Road, pedestrian and cycle access, open space, landscaping, earthworks, surface water drainage, and internal infrastructure. Indicative capacity of homes increased. As of 31/03/2024, 17 dwellings have been completed under this permission.

6.52 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The site submission and site specific evidence have been considered to inform the capacity. The indicative capacity of 280 homes (24 dwellings per hectare), which also reflects the planning permission (21/03955/FUL) for the site, is considered appropriate based on local character and the edge of village location. The site capacity also includes the onsite provision of landscape, open spaces and other necessary infrastructure. The majority of the site allocation is covered by this planning application with the exception of the existing Wellcome Campus. The including the existing Wellcome Campus may be subject to further densification. The overall capacity of the site may be subject to further consideration and assessment.

## Response to issues raised in representations

6.53 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording – heritage assets were considered through HELAA and no impacts were highlighted. Additionally, the Committee report states the site is not located near to any listed building or a conservation area and is therefore considered

acceptable in heritage terms given that no harm would arise to any nearby heritage assets and therefore, no change to policy approach.

- transport infrastructure improvements are needed – issue considered during initial site proposal which informs policy wording.
- the green space to be provided is negligible – planning permission and s106 agreement has secured on/off site provision of open space in accordance with adopted policies. If any changes are sought, these would be considered against the relevant open space policies.
- need to protect watercourses – Generally all development proposals should not have an adverse impact on watercourses and this will be addressed by the relevant policy in the local plan. No change to policy approach.
- housing density is inappropriate – as set out above the proposed housing density reflects local character, the edge of village location and necessary mitigation measures. No change to policy approach.
- needs to consider design principles for Sawston set out in guidance – development proposals will need to achieve high quality design in accordance with the policies of the local plan and the Sawston Village Design Guide. No change to policy approach.
- no need for allocation as full planning application being considered – the development is under construction, however, there needs to be a policy in place until the development is completed to provide a framework against which any proposed revisions can be considered. No change to policy approach.
- protect fertile soils, woodland and farmland – as the site is allocated for residential development within the adopted 2018 South Cambridgeshire local plan and has gained planning permission, the principle of residential development on the site has already been established. Suitable mitigation measures were secured through the application, and would be required from any subsequent applications.
- conserve historic, rural and parkland character, and consider impacts on landscape – these issues were considered through the initial allocation in the adopted 2018 SCLP and the necessary site-specific policy requirements are set out in the site allocation. No change to policy approach.

## Employment

### S/RSC/CC: Comfort Café, Fourwentways

#### New or updated evidence

- 6.54 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that one Grade II Listed Building, the Temple Café and Restaurant, is located under 200 metres south

of site. The HIA recommends implementing design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building heights and screening, to ensure there are no impacts on the setting of designated assets. The HIA states that development should be a sympathetic height lower than the surrounding treescape and local buildings. The HIA states that archaeological mitigation may also be required. The key issue for this site is the risk of impacting the setting of the listed building and the potential for archaeological remains to survive on the site. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have also been added to the policy. The HIA recommends that assessment of potential archaeological remains in the site is undertaken before development commences.

**6.55 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are areas of the site at low risk of surface water flooding, and small areas of medium or high risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur across the whole site, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

**6.56 Further consideration of site capacity:** The site has been proposed as a single plot. The developable area is around 0.79 hectares which covers the whole site, applying a 0.4 plot ratio which is reflective of the local context, would deliver a capacity of approximately 3,000 sqm. An analysis of this site has indicated that is important for new development to take a positive approach to landscaping. This analysis led to the recommendation that the massing of the blocks should be set at an appropriate level of three storeys. Implementing this will ensure that the development has a positive impact upon the surrounding area and preserve the character of the historic rural approach into Cambridge. Development requirements have been added to the policy reflecting this advice.

### Response to issues raised in representations

**6.57** Historic England highlighted the need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirements have been added to the policy.

## S/RSC/FSS: Former Spicers Site, Sawston Business Park, Sawston

### New or updated evidence

- 6.58 Planning permission: full planning permission was approved on 14 August 2020 (S/0158/20/FL) for 50,445 square metres of research and development floorspace, including ancillary uses. As of 31/03/2025, the permission has not been implemented and therefore the permission has lapsed.
- 6.59 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that the northern part of Borough Hill, a large multivallate hillfort, is located within the south of the site. Borough Hill is the second largest of the seven hillforts known in Cambridgeshire and on the Heritage at Risk Register. There are also several non-designated archaeological heritage assets within the site. The key issue for the site is the archaeological assets. The HIA states that development should locate development away from the Scheduled Ancient Monument and introduce robust landscape buffers around it, whilst there should also be careful design of new built form to limit key views and minimise visual harm on the monument. There is also a recommendation to require an archaeological management plan.
- 6.60 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. Parts of the site are within 100 metres of Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. When taking into account the impacts of climate change, part of the site (14%) would fall within Flood Zone 2 (without flood defences). The site also becomes a “dry island” in the Environment Agency’s climate-change-adjusted model of flood risk (without flood defences). The whole of the site has the potential for groundwater flooding to occur at surface level. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a medium risk of flooding, and the site-specific flood risks and opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 6.61 Further consideration of site capacity: The existing planning permission for the site for a Research and Development facility was approved in August 2020 and has not lapsed (S/0158/20/FL). This permission covers approximately a third of the site area. Whilst there is likely to be further capacity further evidence would be needed on site specific issues such as access.

## Response to issues raised in representations

**6.62** This is a new site; therefore, no earlier representations have been received.

## Sites in the First Proposals that are not included in the Draft Local Plan

### Housing

#### **S/RSC/HW: Land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford**

##### New or updated evidence

**6.63 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** the HIA notes the key issues for this site, parts of which contribute to the rural setting of the Stapleford Conservation Area and Grade II\* listed Church of St Andrew, are where the site contributes to the backdrop of views from the church and churchyard. As such the HIA recommends design-based mitigation should enable the delivery of housing on the site to ensure the development safeguards the setting of the Stapleford Conservation Area and Grade II\* listed Church of St Andrew, restricting building heights to 2-3 residential storeys and focussing development to the west and south of the site, to limit risk of visual intrusion and to reduce spread into the wider rural context of the Conservation Area; and establishing a landscape buffer and screening to the eastern part of the site to respect views from the Church of St Andrew and its Churchyard and to the Church of St Andrew vicarage, a Building of Important Character. Additionally, the HIA indicates significant potential for archaeological remains within the site as the area around site contains a range of known extant and excavated sites and numerous archaeological finds and recommends investigation required (starting with desk-based assessment) to identify the presence and significance of as yet unknown archaeological remains across the site. Further mitigation if required and depending on the significance of any remains found, could include avoidance and preservation in situ, further investigation, or recording.

**6.64 Updated Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) for the site:** Following the submission of additional evidence and information from the site promoter, the site could be unsuitable for development should the layout and form of development seek to extend the site boundary further to the north west and separate the open space provision from new homes.

**6.65 Further consideration of site capacity:** The site submission and site specific evidence have been considered. Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Highways Authority for the area, confirmed that a single point of entry for approximately 120 homes is acceptable in principle..

### Reasons why not included in the draft Local Plan

6.66 This 6.1-hectare greenfield site on the edge of Great Shelford was identified for approximately 100 homes in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals. After reviewing comments received on the consultation and further evidence through the Housing Land and Availability Assessment the site remains a deliverable option. However, allocating the site would require removing the land from the Cambridge Green Belt, and demonstration of exceptional circumstances that this was necessary.

6.67 At the First Proposals stage the Council considered that there was a case for this given the limited availability of sites in the rural southern cluster area. The decision to allocate the new settlement at Grange Farm now means there is a significant allocation in this area and on the route of the Cambridge Southern Corridor transport improvements. Sufficient sites have been identified in the Local Plan to meet the need for residential development on alternative sites without the need to release land from the Green Belt. It is therefore no longer considered that there are exceptional circumstances of the green belt release, and the allocation has not been proposed in the draft plan.

### Response to issues raised in representations

6.68 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- fails to meet the exceptional criteria for Green Belt release – On balance and considering changing circumstances since the First Proposals, the site is no longer proposed for allocation.
- Historic England highlighted the need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording – Following the First Proposals Heritage Impact Assessments were commissioned on proposed allocations including this site.
- poor quality access to the site and will create congestion – Consultation with the Highway Authority identified that suitable access is capable of being identified.
- proximity to railway station will make homes attractive to London commuters rather than locals – It is acknowledged that the site is well

connected to Cambridge and other employment areas due its location near public transport infrastructure including Shelford railway station. However suitable alternative sites to meet needs have been identified.

- based on promise of transport initiatives which have not yet been approved - the site is well located to existing railway station with good access to Cambridge and Biomedical Campus once the new Cambridge South Station is open. However, the site is no longer proposed to be allocated.
- should include requirements for public open space – Policy wording includes requirements for Landscape buffers, screening and open space. Development requirements have been added to the policy whilst other Plan policies set out open space requirements for new development.
- need Green Belt mitigation along northern and eastern boundaries - Mitigation measures would be required if the site were to be allocated.
- will destroy flora, fauna and arable land - Mitigation measures would be required if the site were to be allocated.
- should reduce the area of land proposed for development - The site is no longer proposed to be allocated.
- will contribute to the merging of Great Shelford and Stapleford and coalescence with Cambridge - Suitable mitigation measures are possible, but the site is no longer proposed to be allocated.
- will affect local character and impact on long views to the rolling chalk hills - Suitable mitigation measures are possible, but the site is no longer proposed to be allocated.
- would severely impact Gog Magog Hills, Wandlebury and the rural landscape - Suitable mitigation measures are possible, but the site is no longer proposed to be allocated.
- existing infrastructure (e.g. water supply, schools, doctors) is already overstretched and additional development will add further pressure - Suitable mitigation measures are possible, but the site is no longer proposed to be allocated.
- proposed development does not materially contribute towards the overall housing need - the Greater Cambridge Local Plan identifies a range of sites to meet the objectively assessed need and this is further considered through the strategy topic paper.

## **Allocations not proposed to be carried forward in the draft Local Plan**

## Housing

6.69 The following residential allocations within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 have been built out, and are therefore not proposed to be carried forward:

- H1/b: Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston

6.70 The following residential allocations within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 are not proposed to be carried forward for the reasons set out below:

- H1/a: Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston – much of the site has been taken forward for redevelopment as employment land, making it no longer available for housing.

## Employment

6.71 The following employment allocations within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 are not proposed to be carried forward for the reasons set out below:

- E/4(2): Pampisford: West of Eastern Counties Leather, London Road – the Greater Cambridge Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study (November 2020) recommends that the allocation is no longer required, as the wider area has been substantially developed.

## Policy S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster

This section provides policies for one new and one existing policy areas within the rural southern cluster area.

## Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

6.72 General issues raised in the representations include:

- support the requirement for improved cycling networks to enable access from rural areas to the surrounding the sites,
- need for the correct transport policy as some areas have very limited public transport,
- suggested that Granta Park has its own policy area to provide a locally agreed framework for future development, and
- request for a site to be removed from the Green Belt – Greenhedge Farm, Stapleford.

## **Response to issues raised in representations**

6.73 Responses to general issues raised in representations include:

- General comments regarding transport and accessibility are noted. The plans and its proposals have responded to opportunities to support sustainable travel and will require developments to contribute appropriately to new infrastructure.
- Granta Park is now proposed to have a standalone policy in the draft local plan.
- Greenhedge Farm, Stapleford – the representation seeks to have the land removed from the green belt due to its limited contribution to green belt purposes. Whilst the Cambridge Green Belt Study confirms this, exceptional circumstances would be needed to remove the land from the green belt. Those circumstances are not present. It is identified as visually important open land in the emerging Great Shelford and Stapleford Neighbourhood Plan.

## **Policy S/AMC/WHD: Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

6.74 Whittlesford Parkway Station has good connections to both Cambridge and London, is close to the southern cluster research and employment centres and is predicted to see further growth in passengers in the coming years.

6.75 There are opportunities to improve the station to make it a more effective travel hub. Opportunities for improvement are referenced in the Cambridgeshire Local Transport and Connectivity Plan. The area incorporates a range of existing uses including existing employment, a few homes, Whittlesford Highways Depot and Whittlesford Station Car Park. The Greater Cambridge Partnership developed a masterplan for the area, which would seek comprehensive planning and development of the areas to deliver an enhanced transport hub.

### **Policy context update**

6.76 National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2024. Chapter 9 of the NPPF (December 2024) promotes sustainable transport, setting out in paragraph 109 that, 'Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led

approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places.’

## Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

6.77 Issues raised in the representations include:

- Cambridgeshire County Council, as landowner supports the promotion of an enhanced rural travel hub at Whittlesford Station and continue to promote their site at Whittlesford Depot for mixed use development.
- Supported by Imperial War Museum (IWM)/Gonville and Caius College who are keen to work with Greater Cambridge Partnership to explore delivery of Whittlesford Parkway Masterplan.
- Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority, noted that the site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for sand and gravel, and part is within a MSA for chalk. The railway, A505 and existing residential and other sensitive properties would be a constraint to working the site for minerals.
- On comment supported this policy they indicated the policy is limited to "redevelopment" of the existing built-up area and suggest the policy area should be expanded eastwards to include the land to the east of Whittlesford Highways Depot.
- A number of other site promoters highlighted the opportunities provided by their sites in combination with this site and the railway station.

## New or Updated Evidence base

6.78 The masterplan for the area has been in preparation for a number years:

- Whittlesford was identified by Greater Cambridge Partnership as a location for a pilot Rural Travel Hub following a feasibility study of potential sites across Cambridgeshire in November 2017.
- [Whittlesford Parkway Station Transport Masterplan - Stage One Report: Baseline Conditions and Initial options](#) was completed in 2018
- [Whittlesford Parkway Stage Two Report](#) was completed in December 2018.
- [Whittlesford Parkway Station Transport Masterplan Consultation Survey](#) - July 2019
- [Whittlesford Parkway Masterplan Addendum](#) was published in 2020.
- Updates were carried out in 2022

6.79 The reports identify opportunities for station improvements along with general improvements to the wider area.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

6.80 Not to include a policy – This is not the preferred approach as this would not support the redevelopment opportunity that exists in this location.

## **Response to issues raised in representations**

6.81 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Support from a number of representors including the landowner, is noted.
- Other sites referenced in representations have been tested through the plan making process and not been proposed for allocations for reasons identified elsewhere in the evidence base supporting the draft plan.

## **S/AMC/GP: Granta Park**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

6.82 This policy will guide any future redevelopment of Granta Park, an important employment area south of Cambridge.

### **Policy context update**

6.83 There have been no changes to the local policy context since First Proposals consultation, as set out in the Sites Topic Paper (2021).

### **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

6.84 This new policy has been created following feedback from the First Proposals consultation. Therefore, there has not been any consultation on it to date.

6.85 The following general issues were raised about Granta Park in the First Proposals consultation, which have been considered when developing the proposed policy:

6.86 Concern about the cumulative impacts of successive developments on local highways and general dependency of the campus on motor vehicles;

- Support for flexible planning policies to support the shifting needs of clusters and proactively recognise opportunities for densification and upgrading of existing facilities to make best use of established research and development parks;
- Support for a review and update to the existing site boundary for Granta Park in the policies map to reflect recent development with planning permission.

## **New or Updated Evidence base**

- 6.87 **Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study:** Life science and ICT locational, land and accommodation needs (2024) – provides evidence on the locational demand of different sectors. Highlights the role of Granta Park, and that start-ups located at Babraham Research Campus that outgrew their premises often move onto Granta Park.
- 6.88 **Planning Applications:** Outline application (22/05549/OUT) for the development of the TWI campus (including means of access) for use by TWI (comprising but not limited to a range of related uses including office and laboratory space, and ancillary facilities including conferencing and non-residential education/training uses) and/or for Research and Development purposes (Use Class E(g)(ii)), following the erection of two new buildings centred off the central service spine (B4 and B5), one building (B6) immediately to the north, and an extension to the existing engineering hall (B3) (with a combined floor area up to 31,500m<sup>2</sup> (GEA) excluding plant), the reconfiguration and external works to the Bevan Braithwaite building, central service spine and the servicing yard, and the provision of a decked car park to the north, surface car parking and cycle parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure (following the phased demolition of a number of buildings, namely BBH, Robert Jenkins, Resonance Shed and Trevor Gooch comprising 10,185m<sup>2</sup> (GEA)) with all other matters, namely layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved was granted permission on 24 January 2024.
- 6.89 A full planning application (24/02507/FUL) for the extension and conversion of the existing R&D building (The Franklin Building, 2 Granta Park) is awaiting a decision.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

- 6.90 Not include a policy – Given the importance of the site, the option of not including a policy has been rejected.

## **Response to issues raised in representations**

- 6.91 This is a new site; therefore, no earlier representations have been received.

## **Policy S/PA/LN: South of A1307, Linton**

## **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

6.92 To provide a policy context for considering proposals on land south of the A1307 which has particular constraints due to it being severed from the services and facilities within the village.

## **Policy context update**

6.93 There have been no changes to the local policy context from that which informed the First Proposals, and is set out in the Sites Topic Paper (2021).

## **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

6.94 Issues raised in the representations include:

- Broad support for policy approach by both Linton PC and several members of the public. Many commented that development in the area would disrupt the historic open landscape, destroying the separation and damaging the individual character of individual settlements. Furthermore, land in this area is a valuable environmental resource, which should be protected. They supported the retention of the land between Little Linton and Linton within the designated countryside; and
- Support from Historic England for this policy approach, noting this policy area includes part of the Linton Conservation Area and many listed buildings; development in this area has the potential to impact upon these heritage assets and their settings.

## **New or Updated Evidence base**

6.95 **Planning Applications:** The decision notice for Appeal Reference APP/W0530/W/22/3292100 stated that Policy H/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan remains relevant.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

6.96 Not include a policy - Not considered a reasonable alternative as it is necessary to set out within a policy that land south of the A1307 is not a suitable location for new residential development due to it being severed from the services and facilities within the village.

## **Response to issues raised in representations**

6.97 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Support for policy approach- No change to policy approach.

## 7. Rest of rural area

7.1 This chapter provides a background summary of the evidence and representations received from earlier stages of consultation on the sites within the Rest of the Rural Area.

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

7.2 Issues raised in the representations include:

- A number of Parish Councils support the strategy for the rest of the rural area. Some considered Neighbourhood Plans should have greater influence on the proposed strategy. They also highlighted preservation of rural character and identity of villages as being important, that development should be limited to that required based on local needs, and should prevent loss of good farmland and countryside.
- A number of site promoters object to the small amount of growth proposed for the rest of the rural area, for reasons including:
  - It ignores the long term viability of rural settlements;
  - It is counter to the national planning policy objective of supporting and promoting mixed and balanced communities;
  - It ignores the need for local affordable housing, and needs more small and medium sized sites that can be delivered more quickly.
  - More investment should be put into villages to improve transport links
- Site promoters suggest that there are opportunities for a cluster of development around Melbourn due to its public transport links and services and facilities, whereas the Melbourn PC state that the village has no further capacity for development based on its existing infrastructure. Comment that
- Garden centres should be recognised within the strategy for the rural area as they provide employment, retail and leisure opportunities, but they are not referred to in the First Proposals plan.
- Support for the rejection of specific sites and requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

7.3 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement.

## Response to issues raised in representations

7.4 Support from a number of Parish Councils support the strategy for the rest of the rural area is noted. Some comments seek further development, that the plan should have allocated more sites, and large number of sites were suggested and assessed. Many of the comments here reflect comments and issues addressed when considering the strategy section of the draft plan. Having considered a range of alternative strategies, the proposed development strategy focusses site allocations for new homes and jobs to the most sustainable locations of Cambridge urban area, the edge of Cambridge and the new settlements as these have: the least climate impact, active and public transport as the natural choice, and jobs, services and facilities near to where people live.

## Land north of A1307, Bar Hill (Slate Hall Farm)

### Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to

7.5 To identify sufficient land to respond to the need for industrial and logistics space identified in the evidence supporting the local plan.

### Policy context update

7.6 National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2024.

## Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

7.7 This is a new site proposal which was not included in the First Proposals consultation.

## New or Updated Evidence base

7.8 [Greater Cambridge Industrial and Warehousing Sector Study 2025:](#) identifies a very significantly higher need for floorspace than identified through previous iterations of our employment evidence. This required the provision of an additional 289,000 square metres of space over and above that met by commitments to meet the identified need. The same study also identifies the preferred locations of industrial and local distribution and warehousing companies, and notes the floorspace requirements for the different sub-

sectors and sizes of business, highlighting in particular that local “final mile distribution uses require up to 9,300 sqm, and that national/regional distribution centres usually exceed 9,300 sqm.

**7.9 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA noted that there are a number of heritage assets in close proximity to the site. The HIA recommends that tall building on the site has some potential to impact on the backdrop of viewpoints; limiting the height, massing and scale of the proposals will assist in reducing potential impacts. As a potential NDHA retention of Slate Hall Farm is advised and its setting will require consideration within any proposed development. Archaeological investigation may be required. Residual risk is considered to be low to moderate. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

**7.10 New Strategic Allocations Assessment: Transport Mitigation Measures (WSP, September 2025):** In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, transport mitigation requirements have been identified that support safe and suitable access for all users, that ensure sustainable modes are prioritised and that the design of internal streets reflects the National Design Guide. Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network in terms of capacity and congestion or highway safety will need to be cost effectively mitigated through a vision-led Transport Assessment process. The measures identified in the strategic allocation proformas set out those transport interventions required to support sustainable and inclusive access for each site. It is important to note that these requirements will be subject to ongoing review and change as more detailed work is undertaken.

**7.11 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the part of the site is situated within and adjacent to Flood Zone 3 (3%) and Flood Zone 2 (4%) – the proportions of the site in Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 increase slightly when taking account of the potential impacts of climate change (without flood defences). Small areas of the site are at low, medium and high risk of surface water flooding. Some of the site is potentially susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level and at surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. There are unmapped ordinary watercourses running through and/or adjacent to the site. Given the size of the site, it is likely that built development can be situated outside of areas of high flood risk using a sequential approach to the site’s design. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation

opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

- 7.12 **Consideration of site capacity:** The site has been proposed by two site promoters. The larger proportion existing of the whole site allocation with the exception of Slate Hall Farm and the existing employment area proposed 240,000 sqm of employment floorspace. The existing employment site has separately been nominated through the call for sites process and these two sites have been brought together. This will enable the site to be planned for and delivered holistically.
- 7.13 The eastern part of the site is identified for green infrastructure, water management and biodiversity improvement. The developable area of the site is around 70 hectares, but also includes hedgerows and other features including a bridleway that need to be incorporated into green corridors and other mitigation. Applying a plot ratio of 0.3, would deliver a capacity of approximately 220,000 square metres which would need to be refined through a landscape lead masterplanning process.
- 7.14 The site capacity will be kept under review and may change, and further refined through the Local Plan and/or planning application process.

### **Further information supporting draft policy approach**

- 7.15 Having considered the reasonable alternative sites available to meet the identified needs, this site offered the best location in terms of meeting key location preferences identified in the Greater Cambridge Warehouse and Industrial Space Needs Report (2025), being close to Cambridge and Northstowe, next to existing active travel infrastructure, such as the A1307 cycleway, which would provide reasonable opportunities for residents from these two areas, and from Bar Hill which is also nearby, to commute to and from the site sustainably. Businesses in the manufacturing / advanced manufacturing and general industrial sub sectors are seeking locations which are readily commutable from Cambridge and on the edge of the City with good network access for both workers and customers.
- 7.16 As the focus of the site should be on meeting the identified local needs, the site should deliver a range of small and medium sized units. Small and medium sized units are defined as less than 9,300 square metres (100,000 square feet) Development should come forward in phases which respond to local needs.

7.17 The design and layout of the site will need to respond effectively to its setting, with a comprehensive landscaping plan, biodiversity protections and enhancements around the Oakington Brook and across the site, and the creation of new green spaces to enhance biodiversity, create recreation opportunities for workers and local residents and mitigate the impact of the development. The site must also take opportunities for integrated water management to reduce flood risk downstream whilst creating biodiversity and amenity opportunities.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

7.18 No Policy. Alternative sites were considered to identify sites to address identified needs, as set out in the Strategy Topic Paper.

## **Response to issues raised in representations**

7.19 This site was not identified in the First Proposals consultation.

## **Policy S/RRA: Site allocations in rest of the rural area**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

7.20 This section provides context for allocations proposed in the draft local plan to help meet the need for new housing and jobs in Greater Cambridge by identifying specific site allocations for housing, employment or mixed use development in the rest of the rural area.

### **Policy context update**

7.21 There have been no changes to the national or local policy context from that which informed the First Proposals, and is set out in the Strategy Topic Paper (2021).

## **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

7.22 Issues raised in the representations include:

- **Proposed approach to site allocations:** Support from some for the overall approach to site allocations in the rest of the rural area, however suggestions included:
  - there are not sufficient allocations and that growth in the more sustainable villages must be part of the development strategy,

- more employment land should be allocated as need large scale facilities and projections of need for storage and distribution uses are an underestimate,
  - need to take account of paragraphs 69 and 79 of the NPPF 2021 which focus on delivering more small sites to support sustainable development in rural areas and allow homes to be delivered more quickly,
  - need to take account of paragraph 104 of the NPPF 2021 which expects transport issues to be considered at the earliest stages of plan-making,
  - villages should be assessed on their merits rather than through a settlement hierarchy,
  - objections to the release of Green Belt land, and
    - sites should be allocated specifically for self and custom build homes.
- **Rejected or de-allocated sites:**
    - support for the rejection of specific sites from individuals and Parish Councils, and
      - requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.
  - **Site specific comments:**
    - **The Moor, Moor Lane, Melbourn (S/RRA/ML):**
      - part of the heritage of Melbourn,
      - concerns raised about traffic, particularly High Street/The Moor junction,
      - will result in loss of habitats and rare plants, animals and insects,
      - site should be fully integrated into proposed greenway and walking/cycling bridge to facilitate active travel,
      - lack of infrastructure within the village to support this development, and
      - landowner supports allocation.
    - **Land at Highfields (phase 2), Caldecote (S/RRA/H):**
      - East West Rail (EWR) seeking updates to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route or its delivery,
      - lack of public transport,
      - landowner is seeking amendments to landscaping criteria to make it more flexible,
      - concerns about coalescence and continuous urban sprawl along the A428 from Caldecote to Cambourne,
      - area of flood risk and therefore requires mitigation, and
      - landowner is seeking amendments to clarify capacity in the light of extant permissions and completions.

- **Land at Mansel Farm, Station Road, Oakington (S/RRA/MF):**
  - release of land from the Green Belt is unjustified,
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
  - concern that development will increase traffic,
  - will have damaging environmental consequences and destroy village character,
  - erosion of gap between Northstowe and Oakington,
  - area is repeatedly flooded,
  - landowner is seeking to increase the capacity of the site, and
  - significant level of development already at Northstowe, and concern that will add pressure to already overstretched infrastructure.
- **Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (S/RRA/CR):**
  - site should be fully integrated into proposed greenway and walking/cycling bridge to facilitate active travel,
  - concern that the employment area will further industrialise the centre of the village,
  - concern that residential element is unsustainable,
  - Melbourn is already overdeveloped and concern that the infrastructure cannot cope with further growth, and
  - landowner supports allocation.
- **Land to the south of the A14 Services (S/RRA/SAS):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
  - there will be negative impacts on the setting of Boxworth village,
  - support for location as regional distribution centre, but does not meet aspiration that “last mile delivery” in Cambridge can be carried out by sustainable modes of transport,
  - further information sought on potential transport and economic impacts of this site,
  - will create increased traffic and unacceptable traffic impacts, and must be considered alongside other nearby proposals,
  - exit from lorry park should be behind hotel as originally proposed,
  - should seek provision of cycleway between the Boxworth and the new NMU bridge over the A14,
  - support policy requirement for strong landscaping, and new tree belt needed,
  - objection to allocation as no natural barrier to prevent further expansion into the wide-open landscape, which has already been damaged,
  - needs mitigation measures to ensure no further expansion towards Boxworth Road and to minimise impact on Boxworth,

- development should be restricted to areas south of Cambridge Services and on other side of Boxworth Road that were both previously used as compounds for A14 improvement works,
- density should reflect density and pattern of non-residential uses in Boxworth,
- mitigation measures needed in relation to noise,
- concerns that will create increased foul and surface water flows into Swavesey system, and must be considered alongside other nearby proposals, and
- landowner supports allocation.
- **Land at Buckingham Business Park, Swavesey (S/RRA/BBP):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
  - further information sought on potential transport and economic impacts of this site,
  - objection to allocation as no natural barrier to prevent further expansion into the wide-open landscape, which has already been damaged,
  - site promoter highlights that a range of B use classes could be suitable on the site, and
  - Cambridgeshire County Council highlights within consultation area for Uttons Drove Water Recycling Area.
- **Land to the north of St Neots Road, Dry Drayton (S/RRA/SNR):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
  - East West Rail (EWR) seeking updates to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route or its delivery,
  - landscaping should emphasise rural location,
  - objection as this site forms green buffer between St Neots Road and A428, and;
  - site promoter is seeking amendments to the boundary.
- **Old Highways Depot, Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham (S/RRA/OHD):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording, and
  - support redevelopment provided that limited to Class E(g)(i) and/or E(g)(ii), and opposition for use of site for Class B8.
- **Land north of Impington Lane, Histon & Impington (S/RRA/H/1(d)):**
  - no objection provided that development is small, maintains the character of Impington, and does not result in coalescence with Cambridge or Milton.
- **Norman Way, Over (S/RRA/E/5(1)):**

- need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording.
- **Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton (S/RRA/H/2):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording, and
  - asks whether the policy will refer to the Former Waste Water Treatment Works west of the A10.
- **Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals (S/RRA/H/3):**
  - need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording,
  - suggestion that site should be expanded to include Capital Park, and
  - landowner seeking de-allocation of the site now that planning permission has been granted for the Ida Darwin site.

7.23 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

7.24 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

7.25 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- **insufficient allocations identified in the rest of the rural area:** a variety of sites have been considered through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment process and assessed against the development strategy for the Local Plan, and those sites identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated. Having considered a range of alternative strategies, the proposed development strategy focusses site allocations for new homes and jobs to the most sustainable locations of Cambridge urban area, the edge of Cambridge and the new settlements as these have: the least climate impact, active and public transport as the natural choice, and jobs, services and facilities near to where people live.
- **more employment land should be allocated:** responding to up to date evidence on the need for employment land the draft plan allocates a range of sites. In combination with the exiting supply this will deliver a flexible employment land supply to meet needs during the plan period. Responding to the Greater Cambridge Industrial and Warehousing Sector Study (2025) a number of further allocations for industry and warehousing

have been proposed as allocations. More information can be found in the strategy topic paper.

- **need to take account of paragraphs 69 and 79 of the NPPF 2021:** allocations for new homes and jobs have been identified across Greater Cambridge, taking account of the development strategy for the Local Plan which seeks to focus growth in the most sustainable locations whilst also recognising the need to support the vitality of villages. Alongside allocations for housing, policies in the Local Plan allow for small windfall housing developments to be brought forward, and therefore the Local Plan will deliver sites to meet the requirements of paragraph 69 of the NPPF 2021 (now paragraph 73 of the NPPF December 2024). Allocations, windfall housing developments, and existing sites with planning permission collectively results in a diversity of sizes and types of housing sites anticipated to be delivered throughout the plan period. More information can be found in the strategy topic paper.
- **need to take account of paragraph 104 of the NPPF 2021:** through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment process, for each site an assessment has been made in terms of its impact on transport and roads, and any mitigation measures identified as being necessary to make the proposed development acceptable have been included as site specific development requirements. Transport modelling has been undertaken from early within the plan making process, and the transport impacts of the different spatial options have been used to inform the development strategy and the selection of sites.
- **villages should be assessed on their merits:** the settlement hierarchy categorises each village based on its sustainability taking account of public transport links, employment opportunities, and availability of services and facilities. The settlement hierarchy of a village has been used to focus the process for identifying sites to allocate, however, other village specific information has also been considered such as access to public transport, the amount of existing committed development, and community aspirations and support for further development. More information can be found in the strategy topic paper.
- **objections to the release of Green Belt land:** The case for exceptional circumstances has been carefully considered to determine whether there are site specific exceptional circumstances to justify their release from the Green Belt.
- **sites should be allocated specifically for self and custom build homes:** Policy requirements require larger sites to include self and custom built homes, at a level sufficient to respond to identified needs.
- **support for the rejection of specific sites and requests for specific sites to be allocated:** new or updated evidence and representations received to the First Proposals consultation have all been considered, and

those sites that continue to be identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated.

- 7.26 The response to issues raised in representations relating to specific sites are included in the response to issues raised in representations section of the specific allocation in the Individual Site Allocations section.

## Individual Site Allocations

### Housing

#### S/RRA/ML: The Moor, Moor Lane, Melbourn

New or updated evidence

- 7.27 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA): The HIA notes this is a small greenfield site adjacent to existing development and the key issues for this site are the risk of impacting the setting and character of the Melbourn Conservation Area and Listed Buildings in the village of Melbourn. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy. The implementation of design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building heights and screening, should ensure no impacts on the setting of designated assets. Additionally, the HIA references known archaeological features from the Iron Age, Roman and Medieval periods and further features include archaeological material spanning from the prehistoric to the modern period in the area indicating potential for archaeological remains within the site. The site is greenfield land, any remains on site are unlikely to have been undisturbed. The report highlights that there is moderate potential for significant archaeology on the site and recommends investigations are undertaken (starting with desk-based assessment) to identify the presence and significance of as yet unknown archaeological remains across the site. Further mitigation, depending on the significance of any remains found, could include avoidance and preservation in situ.
- 7.28 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that very small areas of the site are situated within Flood Zone 3 (1%) and Flood Zone 2 (2%), but the site is adjacent to these flood zones. There is an extremely low chance of surface water flooding. The whole of the site is potentially susceptible to groundwater flooding at surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward

for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

- 7.29 Further consideration of site capacity: the site submission and site-specific evidence has been considered and the indicative capacity of approximately 20 homes (20 dwellings per hectare) accounts for the need for some of the site area to be used for the landscape mitigation. Additionally, planning permissions in the locality (S/2609/11, 31 The Moor, and S/1032/17, Land to the Rear of numbers 46 - 56 The Moor) have both had capacity at circa 30dph, further justification for the published capacity of up to 20 homes.

#### Response to issues raised in representations

7.30 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Comments raised concern that the site is part of the heritage of Melbourn. The HELAA site assessment and HIA evidence confirmed site suitable in heritage terms. HELAA has no heritage concerns with development of the site and HIA has been prepared and informs the policy wording.
- concerns raised about traffic, particularly High Street/The Moor junction. The prepared HELAA assessment states that we have engaged with the local highways authority who have confirmed that the site can be safely accommodated, and there is capacity for further growth. No change to policy approach.
- will result in loss of habitats and rare plants, animals and insects - the HELAA assessment includes consideration of Landscape and Townscape, Biodiversity and Geodiversity matters. The impacts identified through the HELAA are capable of appropriate mitigation. Additionally, the HELAA identifies the possible impact of development on the existing trees and vegetation within the site. Therefore, a specific requirement on this matter has been included in the draft policy. Development requirement added to the policy.
- site should be fully integrated into the proposed greenway and walking/cycling bridge to facilitate active travel – in reviewing the Melbourn Greenway route and proximity to this site, the major additions to connect this site with the greenway to be funded by this small site are not practicable, but in broad terms the site will benefit from the investment in strategic transport infrastructure provided by the greenway scheme. No change to policy approach.
- lack of infrastructure within the village to support this development – Melbourn is a Minor Rural Centre village in the Settlement Hierarchy with the associated range of facilities, and any development of the site would be required to

contribute to the infrastructure necessary to make the development acceptable. No change to policy approach.

### **S/RRA/H: Land at Highfields (phase 2), Caldecote**

New or updated evidence

- 7.31 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** This HIA covers whole site area for the proposed site allocation area HELAA site number 51599a, which includes the portion of that site for potential allocation, now numbered 51599b, to understand the impacts of development on the historic environment, including specific assets and their setting. The HIA notes that this greenfield site has relict landscape features recorded by the HER. Implementation of suitable archaeological mitigation prior to development of the site would be appropriate. The key issues for this site are the risk of impacting potential archaeological features. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 7.32 **Planning permission:** Outline planning permission (S/2510/15/OL) approved on 5 July 2017 for 140 homes, and has lapsed. Reserved matters (S/4619/18/RM) approved for 66 homes on phase 1 on 14 November 2019, and this phase has been completed. There is an undetermined section 73 application (25/03050/S73) and an undetermined full planning application for 66 homes (22/04215/FUL). The full application (22/04215/FUL) cannot be determined until the section 73 application (25/03050/S73) connected to the original outline permission has been determined. Allocation boundary has been amended to include phase 2 only.
- 7.33 Cambridge to Cambourne Transport Scheme: A Transport and Works Act Order application has been submitted by the Greater Cambridge Partnership.
- 7.34 East West Rail Update: On 26 May 2023, the government confirmed its preferred route for East West Rail. The East West Rail Company further consulted on its proposals as part of a statutory consultation from November 2024 to January 2025 ahead of an application for a development consent order.
- 7.35 **Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and site specific evidence have been considered and the indicative capacity of approximately 65 homes reflects that a proportion of the site has been discounted from the developable area to account for the landscape mitigation within the site boundary and remainder of original outline application (S/2510/15/OL).

## Response to issues raised in representations

### 7.36 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- East West Rail (EWR) sought updates to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route or its delivery. On a planning application for the site EWR have indicated no objection to the proposals.
- Lack of public transport was sited. The site is on the transport corridor between Cambourne and Cambridge. The Cambridge to Cambourne transport scheme would provide within walking and cycling distance to the site.
- Comments expressed concerns about coalescence and continuous urban sprawl along the A428 from Caldecote to Cambourne, but a design led approach to the site allows for suitable landscape mitigation.
- Landowner is seeking amendments to landscaping criteria to make it more flexible. However, the landscaping approach required is necessary to ensure no adverse impacts on landscape character and local views. The Landowner also sought amendments to clarify capacity in the light of extant permissions and completions. The site area and capacity has been updated to reflect the remaining capacity of the site.
- Representation highlighted flood risk requiring mitigation. There are some areas of surface water risk in the areas, which can be addressed through relevant local plan policies.

## Employment

### S/RRA/SCS Land to the south of Cambridge Services, A14

#### New or updated evidence

### 7.37 **Greater Cambridge Industrial and Warehousing Sector Study 2025:**

identifies a very significantly higher need for floorspace than identified through previous iterations of our employment evidence. This required the provision of an additional 289,000 square metres of space over and above that met by commitments to meet the identified need. The same study also identifies the preferred locations of industrial and local distribution and warehousing companies, and notes the floorspace requirements for the different sub-sectors and sizes of business, highlighting in particular that local “final mile distribution uses require up to 9,300 sqm, and that national/regional distribution centres usually exceed 9,300 sqm.

- 7.38 **Updated Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) for the site:** The site was assessed through the HELAA as proposed within the draft Local Plan. This combined two previous site submissions, which enlarged the site from the boundary identified in the First Proposals. Given the location of the site, it scored Red for accessibility to local services and

facilities. It also scored Red for archaeology, based on new recordings of middle Iron Age landscape division and enclosure. The policy sets out necessary requirements to mitigate this issue as much as possible.

- 7.39 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that there are no designated heritage assets in or near to the site. The main issue picked up by the assessment was to potential presence of archaeological remains. A survey undertaken on nearby land in September 2022 identified features that are highly likely to continue into the proposed allocation area. While this is not considered an absolute constraint that would prevent development from coming forward, noting the high risk of archaeological harm the policy has been expanded to introduce additional criteria around this risk of harm to ensure that such risks are properly assessed and avoided or mitigated through the development.
- 7.40 **Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025):** The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1, but when taking into account the impacts of climate change, a very small area of the site (1%) falls within Flood Zone 2 (without flood defences). There are some areas of the site at low risk of surface water flooding, and relatively small areas of medium and high risk of surface water flooding. There is an unmapped ordinary watercourse running through or adjacent to the site. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 7.41 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The site has been proposed by numerous promoters, and these sites have been brought together. The site allocation area is 24.58 ha hectares. The developable area is around 20 hectares, to consider the provision of a cycleway, land required and for compounds for A14 improvement works. Applying a 0.45 ratio would deliver a capacity of approximately 90,000 sqm. This plot ratio would reflect the local context and density of the surrounding area. The site capacity will be kept under review and subject to further testing, and further refined through the planning application process.

Further information supporting draft policy approach

- 7.42 As set out in the strategy section of this plan additional land is needed in Greater Cambridge to meet industrial and logistics needs. Our Greater

Cambridge Industrial and Warehousing Sector Study identified key locational factors for this type of use, including proximity to the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and to Cambridge. Having considered the alternatives available, this site is on the Strategic Road Network within a commutable distance of Cambridge, and would have good active travel accessibility to Swavesey. The existing Services would provide services for workers on the site.

#### Response to issues raised in representations

##### 7.43 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- The site allocation includes land in two ownerships. Both landowners submitted representations in support of the proposals.
- The site promoters considered that a further area of land should be included within the site. Following consideration of the proposals, and consideration of the need for additional lorry parking, an additional area of land has been included in the draft allocation.
- Historic England advised that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) should be prepared for the site. An HIA was therefore commissioned, and did not raise any issues that could not be appropriately addressed through mitigation.
- Representations stressed the need for a strong landscaping solution. This has been addressed in the policy.
- Objections to the proposal sited the loss of greenfield land, the potential for future expansion, the impact on foul and surface water drainage, and traffic generation. There are no alternative brownfield sites capable of meeting the needs identified in a suitable location. The site provides a suitable location, and appropriate landscape mitigation can be achieved. Restricting the site boundary to land used during the A14 construction would not provide a sufficient site area to help address the need for this type of use. Site impacts have been considered in transport modelling, but would also need to be considered in detail through the planning application process.

#### **S/RRA/BBP Land at Buckinghamway Business Park, Swavesey**

##### New or updated evidence

7.44 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA): The HIA notes that it is a greenfield site with relict landscape features recorded by the HER. Implementation of suitable archaeological mitigation prior to development of the site would be appropriate. The key issue for this site is the risk of impacting potential archaeological features and views to and from heritage assets within Lolworth. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

- 7.45 Updated Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) for the site: this has not changed the initial assessment outcome and still confirms that the site is not suitable for development. The HELAA assessment hasn't been updated and the site is assessed as Red for site access as it does not have a direct link to the adopted public highway. However, this is due to Cambridgeshire County Council not adopting local roads within business parks. Engagement with the landowner has demonstrated that access can be achieved via an extension to Anderson Road, which serves the business park. Development requirement added to the policy.
- 7.46 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are small areas of the site at low, medium and high risk of surface water flooding. There is an unmapped ordinary watercourse running through or adjacent to the site. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 7.47 Further consideration of site capacity: the site submission and analysis of the capacity of similar sites has been used to determine an indicative floorspace for this allocation. The proposed indicative capacity reflects the local context and plot ratios on the rest of the business park. The site has been proposed as a single plot. The developable area of the site is 2.11 hectares, which covers the whole site. Applying a plot ratio of 0.45, would deliver a capacity of approximately 10,000 sqm. A plot ratio of 0.45 reflects the local context and assessment in HIA that it is a greenfield site with relict landscape features recorded by the HER, and the lower plot ratio reflects the views to and from heritage assets within Lolworth.

#### Response to issues raised in representations

- 7.48 Responses to general issues raised in representations include:
- Support from Cambridgeshire County Council as landowner is noted. In response to the representation by Homes England a Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Site impacts have been considered in transport modelling, but would also need to be considered in detail through the planning application process.
  - One objection points out that there is no natural barrier to prevent further expansion into the wide-open landscape, which has already been damaged.

A suitable site boundary has been defined as part of the allocation, which also allows for suitable landscape mitigation. Any future expansion would need to be considered on its merits, however this is not proposed as part of this Local Plan. The site promoter highlights that a range of B use classes could be suitable on the site. The policy approach identifies that the site should be developed specifically for B2 and B8 uses, which will respond directly to addressing the identified need in the Greater Cambridge Warehouse and Industrial Space Needs Report (2025). Cambridgeshire County Council highlights that the site falls within consultation area for Uttons Drove Water Recycling Area. A requirement to consider and address odour issues has been included in the draft policy.

### **S/RRA/SNR Land to the north of St Neots Road, Dry Drayton**

#### **New or updated evidence**

- 7.49 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA): The HIA notes that there are no Listed Buildings within or near the site, and it does not feature within any Strategic Viewpoints. The HIA recommends implementing suitable archaeological mitigation prior to development of the site. The HIA notes that the area has moderate potential for significant archaeology on site. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 7.50 Cambridge to Cambourne Transport Scheme: A Transport and Works Act Order application has been submitted for this scheme. The route will potentially go through part of the site. Therefore, it is important that the site allocation doesn't compromise the ability to deliver the public transport scheme. Development requirement has been added to policy, and the site area and development capacity has been amended
- 7.51 East West Rail Update: In late 2024 the preferred route for the scheme was announced, and a safeguarding order was issued, which partially impacts on this site. It is important that the site allocation doesn't compromise the ability to deliver the public transport scheme. A Development requirement has been added to policy. EWR will also be consulted through the draft Local Plan consultation.
- 7.52 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. A small portion of the site includes areas of high, medium or low risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with some areas of the site being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level and at surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of

groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

7.53 Further consideration of site capacity: The site submission and analysis of the capacity of similar sites has been used to determine an indicative floorspace for this allocation. The proposed indicative capacity reflects the local context and plot ratios for similar types of development within the wider area.

#### Response to issues raised in representations

7.54 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording – Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. A development requirement relating to heritage and archaeology has been added into the policy.
- East West Rail (EWR) seeking updates to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route or its delivery. The preferred route doesn't run through the site, but a development requirement relating to this issue has been added into the policy to ensure the allocation will not impede the EWR scheme.
- Landscaping should emphasise rural location. A development requirement requiring landscape mitigation responding to the location has been added to the policy.
- Objection as this site forms green buffer between St Neots Road and A428 – The site's impact was assessed through the HELAA process, and the site impacts are considered capable of being appropriately mitigated.
- Site promoter is seeking amendments to the boundary to also include an additional site. The other site (40550) has been considered through the HELAA process and Sustainability Appraisal. Whilst similar in nature to the site proposed to be allocated, this site is further from the Bourn Airfield site, sitting between Hardwick and Caldecote. There are other sites considered more appropriate for allocation.

#### **S/RRA/OHD Old Highways Depot, Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham New or updated evidence**

7.55 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that although this is a previously developed site there are notable risks regarding impact on the setting of the Cottenham Conservation Area and Grade I Church of All Saints. Design mitigation will be required to manage these risks, and an overall moderate risk is concluded. Development requirement added to the policy.

Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

7.56 **Planning permission:** full planning permission (22/01993/FUL) was approved on 4 May 2023 for the erection of replacement two storey office and storage building (Use Class E(g) and B8) and associated service yard (following demolition of existing buildings on the site); together with the provision of independent single storey office buildings (Use Class E(g)), car parking, cycle parking, refuse, landscaping and infrastructure. If the consent is implemented, it will deliver the whole site allocation. Planning permission was later granted on 13 September 2024 (24/01108/FUL) for the erection of replacement two storey office and storage building (Use Class E(g) and B8) and associated service yard (following demolition of existing buildings on the site), together with the provision of independent single storey office buildings (Use Class E(g)),

7.57 **Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and analysis of the capacity of similar sites has been used to determine an indicative floorspace for this allocation. The proposed indicative capacity reflects the local context and plot ratios for similar types of development within the wider area and the recent planning permission. There is an approved planning application covering the whole site under 24/011108/FUL.

## Response to issues raised in representations

7.58 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Historic England highlighted the need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording. A Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Development requirement added to the policy.
- There as a support by CPRE for redevelopment provided that limited to Class E(g)(i) and/or E(g)(ii), and opposition for use of site for Class B8. The Local Plan needs to secure a mix of employment uses to respond to needs identified in the employment evidence and this site is suited to the types of uses proposed. No change to policy approach.

## **S/RRA/NW Norman Way, Over**

### New or updated evidence

7.59 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA): The HIA notes that the site is located 250 metres north of the scheduled monument 19th century Over Windmill and Grade II listed building Over Mill. The HIA recommends that implementing design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building heights and screening, should limit impacts on the setting of the designated asset, however, should prevailing heights be exceeded this could increase risk. The HIA also notes that removal of the treescape within the site would affect intervisibility and remove the rural buffer between the commercial development and Over Windmill, which would pose a 'moderate risk' of impact. The HIA also notes that there is 'moderate potential' for archaeological remains on the site, therefore archaeological mitigation may be required. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

7.60 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. Small areas of the site are at high, medium or low risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with almost all of the site being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. There is an unmapped ordinary watercourse running through or adjacent to the site. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

7.61 Further consideration of site capacity: the site submission and analysis of the capacity of similar sites has been used to determine an indicative floorspace for this allocation. The proposed indicative capacity reflects the local context, the need for landscape buffering, and plot ratios for similar types of development within the wider area.

Response to issues raised in representations

7.62 Historic England highlighted the need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording. In response a Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording.

### **S/RRA/CRH Land adjacent to Cambridge Road (A10) and Mill Lane, Hauxton**

New or updated evidence

7.63 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA assessed the policy allocation H/2 'Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton' which is 8 hectares and much larger than the new site allocation which is 0.4 hectares. Nevertheless, the findings of the HIA are still relevant for the new smaller allocation. The HIA notes that it is a brownfield site. There are four Grade II Listed Buildings within 100 metres north of the site. Three of these buildings are related to water milling of the River Granta, including two 19th century watermills and the 18th century Old Mill House. The remaining Listed Building is an 18th century milestone on Hauxton Mill Bridge. The HIA states that the key issue for this site is the risk of impacting the setting and character of the listed buildings associated with the watermill. It recommends implementing design-based mitigation, primarily by ensuring building heights, masses and materials are appropriate, especially in the northern part of the site near heritage assets. It suggests that development at a scale similar to, or less than, the local prevailing building height of the adjacent 2-storey 21st century residential development may be appropriate, although proposals should be contextually relevant and account for the height, scale and massing of adjacent development. Archaeological investigation will be required to identify the archaeological remains and further mitigation could be required if remains are found. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

7.64 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that there is significant potential for fluvial flooding with 25% of the site situated within Flood Zone 2. This increases to 88% of the site within Flood Zone 2 and 3% within Flood Zone 3 in the Environment Agency's modelled effects of climate change (without flood defences). A small proportion of the site comprises land that has historically

flooded. There is significant potential for reservoir flooding during a wet-day scenario. There is also potential across the whole of the site for groundwater flooding to occur at below-ground level. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a high risk of flooding, and the site-specific flood risks and opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

**7.65 Further consideration of site capacity:** The site submission and analysis of the capacity of similar sites has been used to determine an indicative floorspace for this allocation. The proposed indicative capacity reflects the local context and plot ratios for similar types of development within the wider area. Development requirement added to the policy. Part of the site is situated within and adjacent to and Flood Zone 2, and is adjacent to Flood Zone 3. There is potential for future issues with flooding and the site is subject to a Level 2 SFRA assessment, and therefore any planning application would need to assess the flood risk. This may impact on the employment floorspace capacity onsite.

Response to issues raised in representations

**7.66 Responses to issues raised in representations include:**

- Historic England highlight the need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording. A Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording.
- A representation asks whether the policy will refer to the Former Waste Water Treatment Works west of the A10. This area is not included within the policy. It within the green belt, and development proposals for the site through the development management process have been considered in that context.

## **S/RRA/CH Land at Compass House, Chivers Way, Histon and Impington**

New or updated evidence

**7.67 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes that this is a brownfield site surrounded by predominantly modern development but with some heritage assets within close proximity. The implementation of design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building height, style, and materials, should limit impacts on the setting of designated assets, however, should prevailing heights be exceeded this could increase risk. There are opportunities for design to enhance character and setting of heritage assets. Residual risk is considered to be low.

- 7.68 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. There are areas of high surface water flood risk at the site, as well as small areas that are at low and medium risk of surface water flooding risk. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with some areas of the site being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the below-ground level and at surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.
- 7.69 **Planning permission:** There is a planning application approved for the change of use from office (E use class) to mixed use office (E use class) and case driving test centre on the northern parcel of the site under application 25/00451/FUL.
- 7.70 **Further consideration of site capacity:** The existing building is approximately 8,000 square metres and covers approximately 40% of the site. Whilst the policy supports the principle of redevelopment of the site, further work is required to determine an appropriate plot based design approach to adequately respond to local heritage, amenity and townscape constraints.

## Mixed Use

### S/RRA/CR Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn

New or updated evidence

- 7.71 **Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes a risk of impacting the setting and character of the Melbourn Conservation Area, with glimpses of site providing a rural backdrop to the Conservation Area. Listed Buildings in the village of Melbourn setting and rural backdrop are potentially impacted if development building heights exceed the local prevailing heights. Additionally, the area surrounding this undisturbed greenfield land site contains a range of known extant and excavated sites, and numerous archaeological finds indicating significant potential for archaeological remains within the site requiring mitigation. The HIA recommends that the implementation of design-based mitigation, primarily in the form of building height, style, and materials, limiting impacts on the setting of designated assets. Mitigation measures to

ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.

7.72 Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test (2025): The sequential test notes that the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. A small portion of the site includes areas of high, medium or low risk of surface water flooding. There is potential for groundwater flooding to occur, with the whole site being susceptible to groundwater flooding at the surface level, but this does not indicate the magnitude of groundwater flooding risk. There is an unmapped ordinary watercourse running through or adjacent to the site. Noting the above, the site is assessed as having a low risk of flooding, but the site-specific opportunities for flood risk management should be explored further. Therefore, the site was put forward for assessment as part of the Level 2 SFRA to further explore the site-specific flood risks and flood mitigation opportunities. Development proposals would be required to comply with the relevant flood management policies in the Local Plan.

7.73 **Further consideration of site capacity:** the site submission and site specific evidence have been considered and the indicative capacity of approximately 120 homes (30 dwellings per hectare over 4 hectares) reflects that a proportion of the site has been discounted from the developable area to account for the landscape mitigation within the site boundary. The site submission and analysis of the capacity of similar sites has been used to determine an indicative employment floorspace of 8000 square metres for this allocation. The proposed indicative capacity reflects a plot ratio of 0.32.

#### Response to issues raised in representations

7.58 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- A number of comments supported the allocation, which are noted.
- There was concern that the employment area will further industrialise the centre of the village. The site can be designed to respond to its setting, and policy wording has been included to reflect this.
- The sustainability of the site was also challenged. Melbourn is considered to be a sustainable location as it is a Minor Rural Centre in the settlement hierarchy. It adjoins significant employment sites. In the wider area there are sustainable transport options including Meldreth station, and the Melbourn Greenway route adjoins the site.
- Melbourn Parish Council expressed concern that the infrastructure cannot cope with further growth. As a minor rural centre, it is considered that Melbourn has a range of services and facilities, and relevant contributions will be sought from developers where necessary to mitigate the impact development.

## S/RRA/FID Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals

### New or updated evidence

- 7.74 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes the eastern area of the site has been approved for housing development. Design-based mitigation is required to limit potential impacts on Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings, to lower the risk of significant residual harm low. Archaeological investigation might also be required. The key issues for this site are the risk of impacting the character and setting of the Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area, the Fulbourn Conservation Area, and Listed Buildings and of intruding on Viewpoints. Mitigation measures to ensure heritage assets and their setting are protected have been added to the policy.
- 7.75 Planning permission:** detailed planning permission has been granted for 203 dwellings and land for community provision: outline application (S/0670/17/OL) was approved on 7 November 2019 with reserved matters (20/05199/REM) approved on 30 April 2022. The Ida Darwin and Fulbourn Hospitals Development Brief for this site was endorsed by the Council in 2014.
- 7.76 Further consideration of site capacity:** The consented planning application and site-specific evidence have been considered. The indicative capacity of approximately 200 homes on the circa. 6.95ha of developable land (29 dwellings per hectare) reflects the local context, whilst preserving and enhancing the Cambridge Green Belt and the setting of the Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area and other surrounding heritage assets. This is reflected in the approved outline planning application under proposing 203 homes on the site S/0670/17/OL.

### Response to issues raised in representations

- 7.77 Responses to issues raised in representations include:**
- Historic England advised to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the policy wording. Details have been added to the policy wording.
  - There was a suggestion that site should be expanded to include Capital Park – the Ida Darwin site was identified in earlier local plans responding to the specific site circumstances of the redundant hospital in the green belt. Capital park is a separate site with different site circumstances.
  - The landowner is seeking de-allocation of the site now that planning permission has been granted for the Ida Darwin site. It is appropriate to retain a policy to guide future sensitive redevelopment of the site whilst the planning

permission remains unimplemented, and the site remains undeveloped. No change to policy approach.

## Sites in the First Proposals that are not included in the Draft Local Plan

### Housing

#### S/RRA/MF Land at Mansel Farm, Station Road, Oakington

New or updated evidence

**7.78 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA):** The HIA notes this greenfield site provides a landscape buffer between two Conservation Areas Oakington and Westwick. The site's surrounding field contributes to the rural backdrop of both Conservation Areas, which include a series of Grade II\* and II Listed Buildings. The site and field provide a distinction between these rural settlements. Development of this site poses a high risk of eroding the rural character of the heritage assets, diminishing the distinction between the two settlements, and eroding their rural context. The key issues are the risk of impacting the setting and character of Oakington and Westwick Conservation Areas and local Listed Buildings, including limited screening of Westwick Hall and Gardens from the site, as such the site is unlikely to be suitable for development from a heritage perspective. The HIA further states, as this is a greenfield site and the area around the site contains a range of known extant and excavated sites and numerous archaeological finds, indicating significant potential for archaeological remains. As such any remains on site are unlikely to have been disturbed, there is moderate and to high potential for significant archaeology on site, an additional inhibiting factor to development. Significantly altering the extent of the allocation may decrease the risk of residual harm; however, this would require further in-depth assessment, alongside archaeological investigation and following any application of suitable mitigation strategies, the risk of significant residual harm is still moderate to high as such the HIA study concludes that this site should not be allocated for development given high risk of adverse heritage impacts.

**7.79 Updated Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) for site 40190a:** this update to the assessment has not changed the assessment outcome. Sites 40190a and 40190 were both tested at First Proposals, however, 40190 was subject to areas of flooding being partly within flood zones 2 and 3 covering over a third of the site extent with the reduced extent of site 40290a is wholly within flood zone 1. A greater density was put forward through the updated HELAA at a total of 35 homes, and assessment outputs remain unchanged.

## Reasons why not included in the draft Local Plan

7.80 This 1.43 hectare agricultural greenfield site within the Cambridge Green Belt was proposed as an allocation for approximately 20 homes in the Local plan First Proposals (2021) consultation. At that time, its close location to a Guided Busway stop was considered to provide exceptional circumstances for the release of land from the Green Belt where development would result in a moderate high level of harm to its purposes. However, having undertaken a HIA, this concludes that development in this location would have a high risk of adverse impacts on heritage assets, and therefore the site should not be allocated for development. This site is therefore no longer being proposed for allocation.

## Response to issues raised in representations

7.81 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- release of land from the Green Belt is unjustified - the Cambridge Green Belt Study (2021) identifies that release of land in this area would result in a moderate high level of harm to the Green Belt. The site was identified due to its access to sustainable transport opportunities. However it is no longer proposed to be allocated.
- need to consider heritage assets and recommend that a Heritage Impact Assessment is prepared to inform the policy wording - Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the reasoning for not including the site in the draft Local Plan.
- concern that development will increase traffic – as a group village these are generally less sustainable locations for new development however the site is adequately located to the busway providing excellent public transport access, potential impact on the functioning of trunk roads and/or local roads could be reasonably mitigated through design.
- will have damaging environmental consequences and destroy village character - a Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and informs the reasoning for not including the site in the draft Local Plan.
- erosion of gap between Northstowe and Oakington - as set out above the site is no longer proposed to be included in the draft local plan.
- area is repeatedly flooded – the HELAA 2021 assessment states the extent of the site 40190a is wholly within flood zone 1 and Surface water flooding only of the site 1% lies in the 1 in 1000 year event extent.
- landowner is seeking to increase the capacity of the site – the capacity of the site has been assessed at the 35 homes capacity through the HELAA 2023 updated assessments which does not change the overall assessment result. However as set out above the site is no longer proposed to be included in the draft local plan.
- significant level of development already at Northstowe, and concern that will add pressure to already overstretched infrastructure – HELAA assessment

states the site has adequate accessibility to key local services, transport, and employment opportunities and that the proposed development would not require delivery of accompanying key services.

### **S/RRA/H1/d: Land north of Impington Lane, Histon & Impington**

New or updated evidence

**7.82 Planning permissions:** The site has full planning permission (S/1486/18/FL) for 26 dwellings, which was allowed on appeal in June 2019. The development was completed in 2020-2021.

Reasons why not included in the draft Local Plan

**7.83** The development on this site has been completed and therefore there is no need to carry forwards this allocation.

Response to issues raised in representations

**7.84** Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- no objection provided that development is small, maintains the character of Impington, and does not result in coalescence with Cambridge or Milton – the site is completed and is no longer being proposed for allocation.

## **Allocations not proposed to be carried forward in the draft Local Plan**

### **Housing**

**7.85** The following residential allocations within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 have been or are being built out and are sufficiently advanced that they do not need a policy framework any longer, and are therefore not proposed to be carried forward:

- H1/e: Land off New Road and rear of Victoria Way, Melbourn
- H1/f: Green End Industrial Estate, Gamlingay
- H1/g: Land east of Rockmill End, Willingham
- H1/h: Land at Bennell Farm, Comberton

## Employment

**7.86** The following employment allocations within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 are not proposed to be carried forward for the reasons set out below:

- E/4(1): Longstanton: North of Hattons Road up to the bypass – this site was first identified in the 1993 Local Plan, as part of the Home Farm development. It has not come forward for employment uses, and does not warrant continued allocation given the alternative sites available.
- E/5(2): Papworth Everard: Ermine Street South – the development has been completed.

## Policy S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area

7.87 This section provides the context for five existing policy areas within the rest of the rural area outside the rural southern cluster area which are proposed to be carried forward into the new local plan.

## Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

7.88 General issues raised in the representations include:

- general support from parish councils for the policy areas in the rest of the rural area,
- policies in neighbourhood plans should be respected,
- support for the lack of any proposals to develop in the area of Little Linton, therefore enabling protection of its identity,
- support from Fen Ditton PC for the exclusion of any sites within their parish, and
- strategy needs to include appropriate distribution of growth in villages to enable them to thrive and sustain local services.

## Response to issues raised in representations

7.89 Responses to general issues raised in representations include:

- General support for policies is noted.
- Neighbourhood Plans have been taken into account when preparing the draft local plan.
- Some representations consider there should be more sites allocated in villages, and a significant number of sites have been put forward through the call for sites process. The strategy approach to meeting development needs is set out in the strategy topic paper. Whilst a number of allocations have been identified in villages, and policies support windfall development within

settlements, the plan has focused on more sustainable options for meeting growth needs.

## **Policy S/AMC/IWM: Imperial War Museum, Duxford**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

7.90 The policy will provide a continued context for future development proposals at the Imperial War Museum, Duxford.

### **Policy context update**

7.91 No policy context update.

### **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

7.92 Historic England highlighted the importance of considering heritage assets on the site, and recommended production of a Heritage Impact Assessment. IWM and Caius highlighted site submissions proposing additional development.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

7.93 No policy, and rely on normal policies elsewhere in the plan – This alternative is not the preferred approach as the museum is of national importance, and needs an appropriate policy framework to enable its continued evolution.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

7.94 Heritage considerations and the future success of the museum are the key purpose of the policy. Policy wording will require heritage is fully considered when considering any future development proposals.

## **Policy S/AMC/R/PH: Papworth Hospital**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

7.95 The policy is seeking to guide development in a historically important site and ensure that future development proposals will deliver appropriate uses to improve the economy of Papworth.

## **Policy context update**

7.96 There have been no changes to the national or local policy context from that which informed the First Proposals, and is set out in the Strategy Topic Paper (2021).

## **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

7.97 Issues raised in the representations include:

- Support for a flexible policy approach to allow for mix-use developments;.
- Concern for mitigating potential impacts on the ancient woodland adjacent to the site with the suggestion of a buffer strip;
- a HIA should be produced and the wording from this should be used to inform the policy wording; and
- a design guide should be created for the site to conserve historic environment of site.

## **Response to issues raised in representations**

7.98 There was a request to have a flexible policy to allow for mix-use developments. The uses on the site, which prioritises health care, have been reached by a logical evidence-based process. If no health care uses can be provided on the site, then the policy explains how other uses could be sought. Given the impact of loss of major healthcare facilities on the village the approach which was adopted in previous plans is considered appropriate to be continued.

7.99 Comments suggested that a Heritage impact assessment or design guide should be produced. A HIA hasn't been produced for this site but there is a recent conservation area appraisal which includes site guidance. There is also a village design guide. There was a request for a buffering strip between the site and ancient woodland adjacent to the site, but such issues can be considered through the development management process.

## **Policy S/AMC/FD: Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

7.100 This policy is an update to Policy 'H/5: Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate' in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. The policy

seeks to guide redevelopment and re-use of land and buildings within the former Land Settlement Association (LSA) estate.

### **Policy context update**

7.101 The first proposals put forward a policy approach which maintained the policy approach from the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 of requiring very high environmental standards for residential buildings. However, as the draft plan has developed, it has become clear that policies within the Climate Change theme of the Local Plan will be requiring very high environmental standards for residential buildings throughout the plan area. Therefore, it is no longer necessary for the policy area to require specific environmental standards for residential buildings.

### **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

7.102 Issues raised in the representations include:

- No objection to carrying forwards policy while being mindful of potential impacts of heritage assets.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

7.103 No additional alternative approaches identified.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

7.104 Comments noted. Policies requirement heritage considerations to be appropriately addressed will apply to any development in the policy area.

## Policy S/AMC/HIS: Mixed Use Development in Histon & Impington Station Area

### Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to

7.105 The policy will provide the context for the further redevelopment in the area around the former station.

### Policy context update

7.106 There have been no changes to the national or local policy context from that which informed the First Proposals, and is set out in the Strategy Topic Paper (2021).

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

7.107 Issues raised in the comments to the First Proposals consultation included:

- Support for the policy, which is endorsed by the Neighbourhood Plan; and
- Historic England have concern for mitigating potential impacts on heritage assets near the site.

### New or Updated Evidence base

7.108 **Planning Permissions:** The site known as the Former Bishops Hardware Store site, Cambridge Road, Impington: This site has full planning permission (reference: 21/02902/FUL) for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of 38 dwellings, and construction work has started on site.

7.109 The site known as the Former Station Site, which includes the derelict Histon & Impington Railway Station, 94-96 Station Road, Impington: The site has full planning permission (S/0783/17/FL) for the restoration and redevelopment of the former station building to create a ground-floor commercial unit and two dwellings, and the erection of 10 dwellings. By March 2021, all 12 dwellings and the commercial unit had been completed.

7.110 The site known as the Station Road Garage, Station Yard, Station Road, Histon: The site had outline planning permission (reference: S/2010/17/OL) for 32 dwellings and amenity space. However, a reserved matters planning application was not submitted within the required time, and therefore the outline planning permission for 32 dwellings and amenity space has since lapsed. Pre-application discussions have commenced regarding a new proposal for this site's redevelopment.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

7.111 Not include a policy - This alternative is not the preferred approach as development of this area is still underway, and the approach is supported in the neighbourhood plan.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

7.112 Support for continuation of the policy from the Parish Council is noted. Any proposals coming forward in the site area will be subject to the heritage policies included in the wider local plan.

## **Policy areas in the First Proposals that are not included in the Draft Local Plan**

### **Policy S/RRP/L: East of bypass, Longstanton**

#### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

7.113 The policy was proposed in the First Proposals consultation to provide a revised policy context for future development proposals in this area of Longstanton that is the last remaining area from the original Home Farm development that secured the delivery of the Longstanton Bypass.

#### **Policy context update**

7.114 No context updates.

#### **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

7.115 There is general support for the provision of new open space and community facilities. However, there were mixed views on the type of housing proposed, questioning the need for affordable housing and suitability of sheltered and older persons housing given the distance from local facilities, whilst suggesting there is a shortage for assisted living.

### **New or Updated Evidence base**

7.116 No new or updated evidence.

### **Draft Policy and Reasons**

7.117 A policy is no longer proposed in the draft local plan.

7.118 This is no evidence that the policy is deliverable. In addition, large parts of the policy area site within flood zone 3, limiting the area and form of development.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

7.119 No additional alternatives identified.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

7.120 Whilst there was some support for the various forms of development proposed, the site area is no longer proposed.

## **Policy S/AMC/PWC: Papworth Everard West Central**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

7.121 To consider the approach to Policy 'H/4: Papworth Everard West Central' in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. The policy sought to guide redevelopment and the re-use of buildings and land within the centre of Papworth Everard to deliver the continued reinvigoration of the village centre and the provision of a mix of uses.

### **Policy context update**

7.122 There have been no changes to the national or local policy context from that which informed the First Proposals, and is set out in the Strategy Topic Paper (2021).

### **Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations**

7.123 Issues raised in the representations include:

- Historic England raised concerns about mitigating the potential impact on heritage assets on and near the policy area.

### **New or Updated Evidence base**

7.124 **Planning Permissions:** Most development opportunities have been completed within the policy area since the adoption of the 2018 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. Planning permissions S/0623/13, S/0307/17/RM and S/0089/16/FL have been completed between 2020 and 2023 delivering a total of 57 dwellings, 8 units for either housing or business use, a brewhouse, a bakery, and community rooms. One outstanding planning permission exists within the policy area on the site of the former St Peters Nurses Home (22/04309/FUL), this application was approved in July 2023 for the change of use of a nurse's home to 9 dwellings, the erection of a dwelling, and the demolition of a creche building. It is unlikely that any further major development opportunities will come forward within the policy area.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

7.125 No additional alternatives identified.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

7.126 Responses to issues raised in representations include:

- Concerns about mitigating the potential impact on heritage assets on and near the policy area are taken into account by requiring developments to be well related to and respecting the character of Papworth Everard.

## **Policy S/AMC/GT: Optimisation of Gypsy and Traveller sites**

### **Issue the Plan is seeking to respond to**

7.127 The Local Plan needs to respond to housing needs in the area, and this includes the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople who have needs for specific kinds of site. Our existing authorised sites at Chesterton Fen Road (Milton) and Smithy Fen (Cottenham) have significant numbers of vacant pitches and / or Gypsy and Traveller pitches that are not being occupied by those meeting the definition of a Gypsy and Traveller.

## Policy context update

- 7.128 **Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS, December 2024)**: The new PPTS includes a number of changes that relate to the delivery of Gypsy and Traveller pitches and / or Travelling Showpeople plots:
- widens the definition of Gypsies and Travellers to include those that have ceased to travel permanently and to refer to “all other persons with a cultural tradition of nomadism or of living in a caravan” (annex 1, paragraph 1),
  - widens the definition of Travelling Showpeople to include those that have ceased to travel permanently (annex 1, paragraph 2), and
  - adds a footnote to set out relevant exceptions to when local planning authorities should very strictly limit new pitches or plots in open countryside away from existing settlements or allocations (paragraph 26 / footnote 9).
- 7.129 **Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy 2024-2029: Homes for Our Future and Annexes 1-8**: The Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy 2024-2029 sets out that both Councils are keen to support other housing options, such as Gypsy/Traveller sites, where there is clear supporting evidence of need.

## Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

- 7.130 Representations relating to meeting the identified accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers are included in Policy S/DS: Development strategy within the Strategy Topic Paper (2025), and representations on the proposed policy for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots (Policy H/GT) are included in the Homes Topic Paper (2025).
- 7.131 Further detail, including where to view the full representation and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement (date).

## New or Updated Evidence base

- 7.132 **Accommodation Needs Assessment of Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Showpeople, Bargee Travellers, and other caravan and houseboat dwellers for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (September 2024) and Addendum (2025)**: An Accommodation Needs Assessment (ANA) has been undertaken by Arc4 (on behalf of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council) to consider the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers, Travelling Showpeople, boat dwellers and other

caravan dwellers. The ANA calculates Gypsy and Traveller pitch requirements in Greater Cambridge, and with its Addendum concludes that for 2023/24 to 2044/45 there is a minimum need for 157 additional permanent pitches for Gypsies and Travellers within South Cambridgeshire, and a potential need for 2 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers within Cambridge – based on national data, but that there is no specific evidence of need. The ANA makes a number of recommendations (see Executive Summary) on what should be considered to help meet the identified need for Gypsies and Travellers within South Cambridgeshire: “Firstly, turnover on existing sites. Secondly, regularising of sites that are not permanently authorised. Thirdly, additional pitch provision using existing sites. Fourthly, making pitches on existing sites available for occupancy by Gypsies and Travellers. Fifthly, sites becoming vacant through household dissolution. Finally, new sites for permanent pitches identified either as standalone sites or associated with major development sites.”

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

7.133 No policy - Not considered a reasonable alternative as plans are required to include targets for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots, having assessed their needs, and set out how these needs will be met.

### **Response to issues raised in representations**

7.134 Responses to the representations on meeting the identified accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers are included within the Strategy Topic Paper (2025) – see Policy S/DS: Development strategy, and responses to representations on the proposed policy for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots (Policy H/GT) are included in the Homes Topic Paper (2025).

### **Further work and next steps**

7.135 The Councils will continue to explore whether there are other authorised Gypsy and Traveller pitches or sites that can also be optimised, and which this policy can apply to as part of the Proposed Submission Local Plan.