

# Infrastructure

## Topic Paper



### Greater Cambridge Local Plan

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

## Topic Paper: Infrastructure

1. Introduction and purpose .....	2
2. Infrastructure chapter .....	3
3. Policy I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity.....	7
4. Policy I/TH: Travel hub facilities .....	13
5. Policy I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles.....	17
6. Policy I/SD: Servicing and last-mile deliveries.....	28
7. Policy I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure .....	39
8. Policy I/AD: Aviation development.....	44
9. Policy I/EI: Energy infrastructure masterplanning.....	46
10. Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery.....	52
11. Policy I/DT: Digital and telecommunications infrastructure.....	57
12. Policy I/CM: Construction management .....	66

# 1. Introduction and purpose

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

1.1 All of the papers can be found on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website.

1.2 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
- 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)

## **2. Infrastructure chapter**

### **Introduction**

2.1 As part of the First Conversation consultation in 2019 we set out our approach to ensuring that high quality infrastructure would be at the heart of the new local plan. The First Proposals consultation in 2021 identified how infrastructure had influenced the emerging strategy, and proposed a series of development management policies which would ensure development delivers timely and high quality infrastructure.

2.3 A number of comments were received on the general approach to the theme. Further detail, including where to view the full representations and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement.

### **Summary of the main issues raised in general comments on the infrastructure theme**

2. 5 Many respondents expressed support for the broad direction of the policies. Some respondents added caveats to their support, requesting that development is located appropriately to maximise the benefits from new strategic infrastructure and that new infrastructure receives adequate investment. Shepreth Parish Council argued that new development should fund the expansion of existing infrastructure. Natural England and the Environment Agency commented that infrastructure and connectivity improvements must be achieved in balance with the need to protect natural spaces and wildlife, ensuring that adverse impacts to the natural environment are avoided.
- 2.6 Some comments focussed on the relationship between national and local government. One respondent argued that discussion should take place with national government to enable Water Resources East to bring forward their timelines for infrastructure projects. Great Shelford Parish Council perceived there to be little joined up thinking between local authorities in relation to overseeing different infrastructure projects. Croydon Parish Council argued that national infrastructure policy will overshadow local policy, rendering the proposals irrelevant.
- 2.7 There were many suggestions to improve the policies. These sought to address perceived shortcomings on issues such as utilities to support sustainable travel and net zero, the need for improved health infrastructure, the needs of disabled people in respect of reducing car travel, the management of journeys to school and college, and broadband provision. A few respondents considered that the forecasted energy grid capacity figures were too low and would need to be increased. A few respondents considered that infrastructure should be operational before new houses were occupied.
- 2.7 Some respondents criticised the public transport system in Greater Cambridge, arguing that it needs to be improved to bring benefits to the area. Universities Superannuation Scheme argued that the Local Plan should recognise an integrated transport solution will take years to deliver and in the interim, there should be no restrictions on existing modes of transport. One respondent questioned whether people buying new homes will necessarily be working or

studying within the 30-minute walking radius. A number of respondents asked for specific traffic interventions in their area and North Newnham Resident Association asked for roads to not be destroyed when things such as bus lanes are added to them.

2.8 There were a few comments arguing against the proposed relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant on the grounds that it was functioning infrastructure. Another respondent argued that national infrastructure projects, such as East- West Rail do not align well with GCSP's proposals. A few developers argued that that their sites were well-placed to deliver the aims of the policy and therefore the Plan should allocate their sites. One commentator argued that GCSP needed to enforce all developer obligations.

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

2.9 Respondents raised a number of important matters through previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan. These matters have been considered during the preparation of the plan and its policies.

2.10 The Councils' response to these matters include:

- The location of development proposed in the strategy has considered the availability and proximity of infrastructure.
- Infrastructure needs have been explored through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies this consultation.
- Water issues have been explored further, and evidence prepared to support the draft plan to demonstrate how a sustainable water supply will be available to support the proposals.
- Anglian Water's proposal to relocate the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment works has now received planning consent, the local plan therefore responds to the development opportunity available near the Cambridge North station.

- Policies are proposed which address the requirements, funding and timing of infrastructure provision.

2.11 More detailed commentary relating to the ways in which the policies in this theme have been amended in response to comments provided through previous consultations are set out below.

## **Infrastructure policies**

2.13 The following proposed policies areas are addressed in this topic paper:

- I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity
- I/TH: Travel Hub Facilities
- I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles
- I/SD: Servicing and Last-mile Deliveries
- I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure
- I/AD: Aviation development
- I/EI: Energy infrastructure masterplanning
- I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery
- I/DT: Digital and telecommunications infrastructure
- I/CM: Construction management.

### **3. Policy I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity**

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

- 3.1 There is a need to reduce the over reliance on car use and high levels of car ownership and to minimise and mitigate the transport impacts of development, including the impacts on the environment and the health and wellbeing of local communities. We therefore need to maximise opportunities for sustainable mode choice, including through place making and adopting the principles of walkable neighbourhoods and co-locating homes with jobs, services and facilities, which reduce the need to travel and put people first, making places more inclusive to everyone. Development will need to respond to and future proof for changing patterns of mobility, technological improvements and encourage innovative solutions.

#### **How the issue was covered in the First Proposals consultation**

- 3.2 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [Policy I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity | Greater Cambridge Shared Planning](#).
- 3.3 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: [Infrastructure Topic Paper 2021](#).

#### **Policy context update**

##### **[National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF, December 2024\)](#)**

- 3.4 The NPPF continues to direct new development to where it can be supported by sustainable transport (paragraph 110), but more recent changes have also introduced a requirement for new allocations and planning applications to adopt a vision-led approach to promoting sustainable transport modes taking into account the type of development and its location (paragraph 112).

### **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP, 2023)**

- 3.5 Replaces the previous Local Transport Plan, it sets out a vision and goals for how transport supports a better future and describes the projects needed to make that new future possible. This includes things like better buses, more train services, reducing pollution and carbon emissions, and helping more people to cycle and walk.

### **Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy (GCTS)**

- 3.6 The GCTS will be produced by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority as a 'child document' to the LTCP and will have two main roles:
- It will provide a detailed policy framework and programme of schemes for the Greater Cambridge area over the short, medium and longer term, consistent with the LTCP.
  - It will support the Local Plan, by considering future levels of growth in the Greater Cambridge area and detailing the transport infrastructure and services necessary to deliver this growth.

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

- 3.7 Many respondents supported the policy. However, a substantial number of respondents added caveats to their support and provided suggestions to improve the policy. For example, some respondents stated that a more ambitious approach is needed, that the effects of home working need to be considered in the policy and concerns were raised about e-scooters.
- 3.8 Some respondents argued that the policy had omitted things such as how elderly and disabled people will be included in the design of transport routes. Some argued that the policy should focus on designing active transport routes and not the provision of car parking. Other comments emphasised the importance of integrating new developments and new communities into existing facilities and transport routes.

- 3.9 Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) suggested including a reference to CCC's Transport Assessment Team's guidelines for new developments. North Hertfordshire District Council asked for more data relating to Cambridge South Station due to their concerns that it could create pressures in North Hertfordshire. Suffolk Council suggested that the policy should aim to enable transport across administrative boundaries. Suffolk Council also argued that there is a need to add rail dualling to the infrastructure delivery plan. Persimmon Homes East stated that the findings from the Active Travel Toolkit must be included in viability assessments. One commentator asked for the Active Travel Toolkit to be available for consultation prior to publication.
- 3.10 Many developers and landowners argued that the policy's aims will be achieved if development is directed to sustainable locations. Linked to this, many developers and landowners argued that their sites were well-placed to deliver the policy's aims. Smarter Cambridge Transport (SCT) argued that growth in the region will lead to an increase in Park and Ride usage, but the Plan has not allocated land for this. SCT also suggested that the Plan safeguards land for infrastructure and includes a policy for planning gain to retrofit infrastructure which is missing from areas which are not reached by funding.
- 3.11 Gamlingay Parish Council suggested that there needs to be a cycle link between Pottton and Cambourne to address the missing link in the Bedford and Cambridge route. There were a few comments criticising the location of East West Rail. Some respondents objected to redeveloping NEC on the grounds that it would increase traffic. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) perceived there to be a lack of joined-up thinking between Greater Cambridge's local authorities. CPRE and a few other respondents argued that there needs to be an integrated transport plan which aligns with the Local Plan. Trumpington Residents Association stated that development should be restricted unless essential infrastructure is planned and financed. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties argued that travel hubs are incorrectly equated as Park and Ride locations.

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

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

- 3.13 The Local Plan Transport Evidence Report demonstrates congestion within Greater Cambridge needs to be addressed to accommodate future growth, and there will likely need to be a vehicular 'trip budget' applied to mitigate the transport impacts of the strategic site allocations to carefully manage the number of additional vehicular trips using the local highway network during the busiest peak periods, which could be accompanied by limitations on car parking.

### **Draft policy and reasons**

- 3.14 The draft policy can be viewed in the Draft Local Plan.
- 3.15 The policy reflects the aims of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (prepared by Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) (as the local transport authority) and other documents adopted by CPCA and Cambridgeshire County Council including the Bus Strategy and Active Travel Strategy, addressing the specific transport challenges and local vision and opportunities. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority are currently preparing the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy (GCTS), a 'child document' to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.
- 3.16 Future development should be planned to enable the co-location of homes close to jobs, services and facilities so people can meet their day to day needs locally, to widen travel choice, reduce the reliance on the car, and to support travel by walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport. New developments should make high quality places, designed around people, with slow traffic speeds and giving pedestrians and cyclists priority. New active

travel infrastructure should be high quality and designed in accordance with LTN 1/20 and the Active Travel Strategy (and Toolkit).

- 3.17 Providing genuine travel choice which is inclusive to everyone, the policy addresses the whole journey including the first/last mile and enabling seamless interchange between modes, and break down physical and perceived barriers to improve connectivity. It is important that new development gives priority to public transport and is designed to be future proof, to respond to future growth, changing patterns of mobility and technological innovations such as autonomous vehicles and Mobility as a Service (MaaS).
- 3.18 This policy ensures development will not have an unacceptable transport impact; increasing vehicular trips on already congested roads or generating more trips using public transport or the existing walking, wheeling and cycling network than there is currently capacity to safely accommodate. Wider impacts on health and the environment, including cumulative impacts, will also be taken into consideration. The policy sets out clear requirements regarding transport infrastructure provision and connectivity that is expected to address increased demand arising from new developments through the planning application process.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

- 3.19 No additional alternative approaches identified.

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

- 3.20 The policy seeks to ensure new development is located and well-designed with high quality connections and transport infrastructure providing real opportunities to switch between different travel modes, to provide a genuine travel choice for people of all ages and abilities and to reduce the reliance on the private car. It prioritises non-car modes but does not exclude cars, to create places and spaces with people at the heart.

- 3.21 The Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) is a suite of documents setting out the long-term strategy for transport in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. It sets out a vision and goals for how transport supports a better future and describes the projects needed to make that new future possible; this includes things like better buses and helping more people to cycle and walk. A range of transport projects and schemes are being planned and brought forward by bodies such as Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Greater Cambridge Partnership, including public transport and cycle routes and new Park & Ride provision.
- 3.22 Part of the LTCP, the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy (GCTS), will evidence the transport measures needed to address travel needs and enable development in Greater Cambridge. Developers will be required to mitigate their transport impacts, including by providing contributions towards the delivery of transport infrastructure identified in the GCTS (and other transport plans), enhancing the provision across Greater Cambridge. Transport mitigation associated with delivery of the development strategy is being considered in the Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Viability Appraisal.

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

- 3.23 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.

## 4. Policy I/TH: Travel hub facilities

### Issue the plan is seeking to respond to

4.1 To maintain a high-quality environment across Greater Cambridge and reduce car use and congestion on our transport network, we need to make it easy for car users, particularly those travelling to the city, to complete their journeys using alternative, sustainable modes of transport. Travel hubs play an important role in supporting more sustainable forms of travel. The policy seeks to support and encourage their use by ensuring they include the right facilities. Facilities should complement the primary use as a travel hub, and be of small scale to avoid the creation of new out of town centres

### How the issue was covered in the First Proposals consultation

4.2 The policy was not proposed in the First Proposals.

### Policy context update

#### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2024)

4.3 Chapter 9 of the NPPF promotes sustainable Transport. Para 109 e) requires local plan policy to identify and pursue opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use. Para 110 states: The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.

#### Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP, 2023)

4.4 The LTCP was approved on November 29th, 2023, by the Combined Authority's Board. The LTCP marks a new era for transport in the region. It sets out a vision and goals for how transport supports a better future and describes the projects needed to make that new future possible. This includes things like better buses, more train services, less pollution and carbon emissions, and helping more people to cycle and walk.

## **Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy (GCTS)**

4.5 The GCTS will be produced by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority as a 'child document' to the LTCP and will have two main roles:

- It will provide a detailed policy framework and programme of schemes for the Greater Cambridge area over the short, medium and longer term, consistent with the LTCP.
- It will support the Local Plan, by considering future levels of growth in the Greater Cambridge area and detailing the transport infrastructure and services necessary to deliver this growth.

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

4.6 This is a new policy approach, so was not subject to consultation in the First Proposals. However, the following representations were made with regards to park and ride usage that have helped to formulate this new policy.

- Transport Evidence shows traffic is assumed to grow from 2015 baseline, contravening local transport objectives, and huge growth in Park and Ride use for which land is not allocated.
- Scale of development puts pressure on travel links to City. Development should be net reducer of greenhouse gases and cars into City, not just provide access to Park and Ride. Subsidise buses, provide for other modes. Long delivery times for large scale infrastructure projects, no immediate effects. Public transport is lifeline to some people; consider good value, single ticketing. Travel hubs are incorrectly equated to Park and Ride; suggest pilots be set up.

## **New or updated evidence base**

4.7 The Local Plan Transport Evidence Report demonstrates congestion within Greater Cambridge needs to be addressed to accommodate future growth, and there will likely need to be a vehicular 'trip budget' applied to mitigate the transport impacts of the strategic site allocations to carefully manage the number of additional vehicular trips using the local highway network during the busiest peak periods, which could be accompanied by limitations on car parking.

## **Draft policy and reasons**

4.8 The draft policy can be viewed in the Draft Local Plan.

4.9 The ability for people to change between transport modes is integral to improve the efficiency of the transport system and can be an important factor in reducing car dependency for whole journeys.

4.10 The Local Plan seeks to build on the success of Cambridge's Park and Ride (P&R) facilities to ensure they can continue to be a viable, realistic sustainable alternative to car use for whole journeys, both day and night. There is great potential for the function of traditional P&R sites to be expanded to become "travel hubs" (or "mobility hubs") that enable interchange between a range of modes transport and in a range of directions, rather than solely moving people from their car to a bus, or from Cambridge's periphery to the city centre. This includes increasing the service and facility offer at traditional P&R sites and other strategic improvements identified in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.

4.11 The creation of travel hubs and the creation of linked trips can play an important role in reducing road-traffic congestion in urban areas, vehicle-related pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, and the risks of road-traffic accidents. The policy is drafted to ensure that travel hubs are the primary function and that any additional use should be complimentary and of small scale to avoid the development of new out of town centres, as this would be contrary to the aims of reducing travel by car.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

4.12 To have no policy on this issue.

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

4.13 This is a new policy approach, so was not subject to consultation in the First Proposals. Comments were received with regards to allocation of land for additional park and ride facilities, this policy seeks to support and enhance the use existing park and ride provision to create travel hubs. Proposals for new travel hub sites in appropriate locations will also be supported in principle, subject to the satisfactory assessment of the proposed development's transport effects, and the demonstration of the need for and feasibility of such development. Applications will be considered on merit it has not been considered necessary to allocate additional land for this purpose.

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

4.14 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.

## 5. Policy I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles

### Issue the plan is seeking to respond to

5.1 There is a need to reduce the over reliance on car use and high levels of car ownership to minimise the impacts on the environment, place making and the health and wellbeing of local communities. Reflecting the higher propensity to cycle in Greater Cambridge than nationally and, given that electric cycles are enabling longer journeys, we should build on this and encourage further modal shift. The availability of car and cycle parking influences modal choice. We therefore need to provide flexibility over the amount of car parking provided to respond to the differing accessibility afforded by non-car modes in urban and rural areas and should consider innovative solutions, such as providing access to car share vehicles particularly to reduce the number of second cars. To facilitate cycling we need to require ample, safe, secure, accessible cycle parking, including for non-standard cycles. Reflecting the national drive to switch to electric vehicles, provision will need to be made for electric charging of vehicles and cycles.

### How the issue was covered in the First Proposals consultation

5.2 The policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [Policy I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles | Greater Cambridge Shared Planning](#).

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

### Policy context update

#### [National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF, December 2024\)](#)

5.4 The new NPPF introduced a requirement for new allocations and planning applications to adopt a vision-led approach to promoting sustainable transport modes taking into account the type of development and its location (paragraph 112).

## **The Building Regulations - Part S**

5.5 The Government introduced new Building Regulations, effective June 2022, requiring electric vehicle charging infrastructure in new and renovated buildings. These regulations, known as Part S, mandate charging points in new homes, those created from a change of use, and in buildings undergoing major renovations with more than 10 parking spaces. Additionally, new non-residential buildings with over 10 parking spaces must also include charging points and cable routes.

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

5.6 A variety of organisations expressed general support for the policy. Some organisations supported the policy but suggested changes, including providing additional information about the required parking standards, providing flexibility to consider site specific circumstances, and minimising visual clutter.

5.7 Some respondents provided critical responses to the policy; North Newnham Residents Association for example wrote that there is a tension between parking provision and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport which could require improvements at the expense of cars. B Hunt questioned whether the policy is needed when the Greater Cambridge Partnership are preparing an integrated parking strategy. A few respondents, including the Home Builders Federation, asserted that electric vehicle requirements should be addressed through building regulations. A few respondents, including Smarter Cambridge Transport stated that the policy title should be amended to reflect a wider range of transport modes.

5.8 Cambridge Past and Present and Future argued that the electric grid will need an increase in capacity of local substations by around 50% to deliver the policy. Persimmon Homes East wrote that viability does not consider the upgrades to the national grid that would be required by the policy.

5.9 Some respondents provided comments specific to the cycle and mobility parking elements of the policy and included suggestions to improve the policy. Examples include using S106 monies to retrofit neighbouring communities, ensuring there is space for non-standard cycles such as e-scooters in new developments, and ensuring that new developments deliver storage for all users. Some respondents provided comments specific to the car parking elements of the policy. Examples include addressing the lack of parking for visitors and deliveries in new developments, including operational parking for logistics uses, and designing new developments in a way which will prevent parking on the pavement.

5.10 Some respondents provided comments specific to the electric vehicle elements of the policy. Examples of the suggestions include addressing the issue of charging points in public car parks and on streets, the need for more charging points at community facilities in rural areas and rapid charging points were perceived to be essential.

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

## **New or updated evidence base**

### **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP, 2023)**

5.12 Replaces the previous Local Transport Plan, it sets out a vision and goals for how transport supports a better future and describes the projects needed to make that new future possible. This includes things like better buses, more train services, less pollution and carbon emissions, and helping more people to cycle and walk.

### **Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy (GCTS)**

5.13 The GCTS will be produced by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority as a 'child document' to the LTCP and will have two main

roles. It will provide a detailed policy framework and programme of schemes for the Greater Cambridge area over the short, medium and longer term, consistent with the LTCP, and it will support the Local Plan, by considering future levels of growth in the Greater Cambridge area and detailing the transport infrastructure and services necessary to deliver this growth.

## **Draft policy and reasons**

5.14 The draft policy can be viewed in the Draft Local Plan.

5.15 There is a higher propensity to cycle in Greater Cambridge than nationally, and increased use of electric cycles is enabling longer journeys. The plan supports this sustainable mode of travel by requiring space for parking of all types of cycles which is secure and convenient.

5.16 Cycle parking must be at least as convenient to access as car parking, located as close as possible to the main entrance or exit points of buildings and have good lighting and natural surveillance. It must not be sited where it obstructs pedestrian or vehicle movement. All cycle parking is to be easy and safe to access and use. Routes to cycle parking must be well-maintained and lit, clearly signed, and provide unobstructed, step-free access, avoiding inconvenient detours, steep slopes, narrow paths, or tight turns.

5.17 Cycle parking must be secure, with high-quality equipment and materials that provide strong support and enable both the frame and wheels to be locked. Spaces should be internal where practicable and appropriate. Facilities must be inclusive for all users and all types of cycles, avoiding any need to lift, drag, or perform difficult movements to park a cycle. Long stay cycle parking should be covered. The design of cycle parking should complement their surroundings, be visually attractive, and be clearly identifiable to users with visual impairments.

5.18 In residential developments, cycle parking should be located in a purpose-built area at the front of the house or within a garage. It may only be located in a rear garden if placing it at the front would conflict with the established character

of the surrounding area and if there is no garage available. Shared cycle parking must have a funded maintenance programme and include provision for monitoring and removing abandoned cycles.

5.19 Larger developments and those within accessible locations will need to be able to accommodate space for dockless cycle hire schemes, such as at mobility (travel) hubs and key destinations. Cambridge City Cycle Parking Guide provides further guidance on the provision and design of cycle parking.

5.20 The Cycle Parking Provision minimum standards were derived from the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 minimum standards for cycle parking provision. The approach combined the standards from both adopted plans prioritising simplicity and favouring more cycle parking provision.

**Use: residential dwellings**

- Minimum standard: 1 space per bedroom
- Commentary: Replicates South Cambs minimum provision, as it is simpler than City option and favours more cycle parking.

**Use: guesthouses and hotels**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, 2 spaces for every 10 bedrooms (minimum 2 spaces)
- Commentary: Follows City minimum standard, as it is simpler than South Cambs option and favours more cycle parking.

**Use: nursing homes**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, 1 visitor space for every 6 residents (Minimum 2 spaces)
- Commentary: Follows City minimum standard, as it is simpler than South Cambs option and favours more cycle parking.

**Use: retirement homes/sheltered housing**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, 1 space for every 6 residents. 1 visitor space for every 6 residents (minimum 2 spaces)
- Commentary: Follows City minimum standard, as it is simpler than South Cambs option and favours more cycle parking.

**Use: student residential accommodation, residential schools, college or training centre**

- Minimum standard: 1 space per 2 bedspaces within City Centre, 2 spaces per 3 bedspaces for the rest of the city and South Cambs, 1 space for every 3 members of staff, 1 visitor space per 5 bedspaces
- Commentary: Follows City minimum standard, as South Cambs option is not specific.

**Use: hospitals**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, 2 visitor spaces per consulting/treatment room, 1 visitor space for every 6 bedspaces
- Commentary: Follows City minimum standard, as South Cambs option is not specific.

**Use: food retail**

- Minimum standard: 1 space per 25m<sup>2</sup>
- Commentary: Follows South Cambs minimum provision, as it is simpler and easier to calculate than city option.

**Use: non-food retail**

- Minimum standard: 1 space per 25m<sup>2</sup>
- Commentary: Follows South Cambs minimum provision, as it is simpler and easier to calculate than city option.

### **Use: retail warehouses**

- Minimum standard: 1 space per 25m<sup>2</sup>
- Commentary: Follows South Cambs minimum provision, as there is no City option.

### **Use: financial and professional services**

- Minimum standard: 1 space per 30m<sup>2</sup>
- Commentary: Follows South Cambs minimum provision, as it is simpler and easier to calculate than city option.

### **Use: food and drinks**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, 1 space per 10m<sup>2</sup>
- Commentary: Combination of City and South Cambs provision to favour more parking.

### **Use: pubs and bars**

- Minimum standard: 1 space per 20m<sup>2</sup>
- Commentary: Follows South Cambs minimum provision, as there is no city option.

### **Use: museums, exhibitions venues**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, some visitor parking on merit
- Commentary: Follows City minimum standard, as there is no South Cambs option.

### **Use: sports and recreational facilities and swimming baths**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, 1 for every 15 seats provided for spectators and;
- 1 space for every 25m<sup>2</sup> net floor area or 1 space for every 10 m<sup>2</sup> of pool area

- Commentary: Combination of City and South Cambs provision to favour more parking.

**Use: places of assembly, including: cinema, theatres, stadia, auditoria and concert halls**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, 1 space for every 4 seats
- Commentary: Follows City minimum standard, as South Cambs has no provision for staff members.

**Use: place of worship, public halls and community centres**

- Minimum standard: 1 space for every 3 seats
- Commentary: Follows South Cambs minimum provision, as it favours more parking.

**Use: offices**

- Minimum standard: 1 per 30m<sup>2</sup>
- Commentary: Follows South Cambs minimum provision and partially follows City minimum standard, as it favours simplicity.

**Use: general industry**

- Minimum standard: 1 space for every 3 members of staff, 1 space per 40m<sup>2</sup>
- Commentary: Combines South Cambs and City for clarity and favours more parking.

**Use: storage and other B Use Classes**

- Minimum standard: On merit
- Commentary: Agrees with both City and South Cambs.

### **Use: clinics and surgeries**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, 2 spaces per consulting room
- Commentary: Follows City minimum standard, as it favours more parking.

### **Use: non-residential schools**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, Cycle spaces to be provided for 50% of primary school children to include a scooter parking area, and 75 per cent of secondary school children, some visitor parking
- Commentary: Follows City minimum standard, as it favours more parking

### **Use: non-residential higher and further education**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, Cycle parking for 70% of students based on anticipated peak number of students on site at any one time.
- Commentary: Follows City minimum standard, as South Cambs only references Universities

### **Use: crèches and nurseries**

- Minimum standard: 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, 1 visitor space per 5 children, an area to be provided for the parking of cargo bicycles/trailers
- Commentary: Follows City minimum standard, as South Cambs does not cover visitor spaces or trailer provision.

5.21 Car Parking is important so vehicles can be stored safely where they don't cause highway problems. Parking displacement and inappropriate car parking impacts on quality of place, causes nuisance and can hinder emergency services. However, car parking is land hungry, can be unsightly, undermines the quality of place, and can discourage travel by sustainable modes.

5.22 It is therefore important that the right levels of car parking are provided in the right places. In areas where there are alternatives for travel, such as close to a

High Quality public transport interchange and well served by active travel, this could mean limited provision or car free development could be acceptable. In more rural areas where people are more reliant on cars more spaces may be needed. A design-led approach responding to the location and the opportunities it provides is required.

- 5.23 Innovative and flexible solutions to reduce car parking in appropriate locations, such as through smart parking and the provision of car clubs and shared parking, including car barns on the edge of accessible larger developments, are encouraged whilst avoiding displacement parking.
- 5.24 Residential garages will only be counted towards car and cycle parking provision where they meet a minimum size requirement; 3.3m x 6m for a car, with an additional 1m at the end and/or 650-750mm at the side of a garage to park cycles.
- 5.25 Building Regulations require Electric Vehicle charging provision for residential and non-residential developments but it is important that in large and strategic developments site wide Electric Vehicle charging needs for other land uses and visitors are considered holistically. Developers must ensure infrastructure for Electric Vehicles is considered and designed-in from the outset and is located so that it does not cause street clutter or conflict with active travel routes and users, and should have regard to section 2.5xvii of Cambridgeshire County Council's [On-street Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Policy](#) which complements the Cambridgeshire [Highways Development Management General Principles for Development- January 2023 - Amended](#), and [Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy](#).

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

- 5.26 No additional alternative approaches identified.

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

5.27 The policy reflects the updated NPPF by requiring developers to justify and evidence the level of car and cycle parking provision for their development proposals through a vision-led approach. The policy provides flexibility to respond to site specific circumstances within the overall transport aim of promoting sustainable modes of transport. Noting that there is a higher propensity for cycling within Greater Cambridge the policy includes minimum cycle standards, including a requirement for a proportion to accommodate non-standard cycles, to ensure sufficient provision to meet local needs.

5.28 The updated Building Regulations set out requirements for electric vehicle charging. The policy ensures there is sufficient grid capacity and that infrastructure for electric vehicles is considered and designed-in from the outset and is located so that it does not cause street clutter or conflict with active travel routes and users. Charging infrastructure requirements is being considered in the Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Viability Appraisal.

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

5.29 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.

## 6. Policy I/SD: Servicing and last-mile deliveries

### Issue the plan is seeking to respond to

6.1 To ensure that new development integrates deliveries and servicing in a way that supports the fulfilment of transport, safety, climate change, design and economic objectives.

### How the issue was covered in the First Proposals consultation

6.2 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [First Proposals Policy I/FD: Freight and delivery consolidation](#).

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

### Policy context update

#### [National Planning Policy Framework \(December 2024\)](#)

6.4 The NPPF was updated in December 2024. Chapter 6 of the NPPF continues to support the growth of the UK economy, but additions have been made to the NPPF in outlining the role that spatial planning can play in supporting economic growth.

- 6.9 In relation to freight networks and storage and distribution, the updated NPPF highlights the following: Paragraph 86 c) notes that planning policies should facilitate the needs of a modern economy, including through the identification of suitable locations for, amongst other commercial activities, freight and logistics.
- Paragraph 87 b) states that planning policies and decisions should support specific locational requirements for different sectors, including making provisions for 'storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in

suitably accessible locations that allow for the efficient and reliable handling of goods’.

### **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority – Draft Freight Strategy**

6.5 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) are preparing an area wide freight strategy, providing a strategic baseline for the alignment of regional freight movements with national ambitions for the UK’s supply chain logistics. The Strategy is still currently in its scoping stages, but the priorities include the consideration of first and last-mile logistics, the use of smart technology and data to improve supply chain operations, and improvements in freight operations to assist in the delivery of a net-zero carbon future, including improvements to rail freight infrastructure across the combined authority area.

### **Department for Transport - Decarbonising Transport: A Better, Greener Britain**

6.6 To support the UK’s national climate targets and statutory climate duties, the Government adopted a plan to decarbonise various aspects of the UK’s transportation systems, including the logistics sector. The Department for Transport’s UK Transport Decarbonisation Plan was updated by the Government in 2023.

6.7 Freight transportation accounts for nearly a third of the UK’s overall transport emissions, of which over 75% can be attributed to road freight activity. As such, the Transport Decarbonisation Plan includes a specific focus on interventions to address freight carbon emissions. Interventions include the increasing the demand stimulus for low / zero-emission vehicles such as electric trucks and vans, the promotion of modal shifts in delivery operations to reduce the need for large road freight movements (particularly less-than truckload (LTL) movements), and changes to last-mile delivery practices that allow for improved cargo consolidation and non-road-based logistics solutions.

6.8 There are also recognised synergies between reductions in greenhouse gas emissions attributable to freight movements and reductions in traffic congestion (more efficient use of vehicles means fewer trips). Local planning policies will

play an important role in helping to facilitate the infrastructure needed to support modal shifts in transportation or innovative, non-road-based delivery solutions.

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

- 6.9 Many respondents expressed support for the policy, for example, the Universities Superannuation Scheme requested that the role of larger logistics, warehousing facilities and last-mile hubs are supported in the Local Plan. Huntingdonshire District Council suggested more information needs to be included to understand how unacceptable impacts to the strategic networks are to be assessed and also requested additional information to assess the impact of developments upon surrounding areas. Histon and Impington Parish Council emphasised the need for GCSP to speak to people in the logistics industry so they can gain more expertise.
- 6.10 Smarter Cambridge Transport (SCT) argued that the Local Plan needs to identify a logistics hub location and included possible suggestions where it could be located and requirements it needed to meet. SCT also asserted that there should be a variety of sites in different locations to provide break-out and consolidation logistic centres. I Butnar argued that cargo cycles for local deliveries and the provision of cycling logistics depots should be common across Greater Cambridge. Similarly, SCT stated that the access roads for logistic hubs should be appropriate in relation to weight and size of vehicles and non-motorised user routes should be sufficiently wide for cargo bikes to use. Endurance Estates argued that Logistical hubs will not address longer journeys by delivery vehicles because the identified need for strategic logistics floorspace will not be met and therefore their site should be allocated.
- 6.11 The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties requested stronger wording in the policy to support the need to move to a system of rail freight and suggested a further 'Green Line' should be established so that existing levels of road freight transport will not increase as a result development. They also proposed ensuring villages have access to freight travel hubs to lower net carbon

emissions. A few developers explained how their sites could potentially deliver the aims of the policy.

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

## **New or updated evidence base**

### **England's Economic Heartland – Freight Study: Full Report**

- 6.13 WSP were commissioned to prepare a report on freight logistics across England's Economic Heartland (EEH) – a sub-regional area that consists of local authority areas extending from Cambridgeshire to Swindon. The report's purpose was to review the supply chain logistics and distribution capabilities across the EEH and develop a series of recommendations for the improvement of freight transportation across the sub-region. The report identifies the need for strong supply chain infrastructure across the EEH to support ambitions for the Oxford – Cambridge arc and the growing knowledge economy bases in the Greater Cambridge area.

### **Last-mile delivery improvements**

- 6.14 Delivery and servicing operations need to be conducted sensitively, and they should not present significant risks to road safety or surrounding communities. The report highlights that, as population centres grow, completing deliveries or servicing activity is likely to become more challenging due to likely increases in the demand for end-to-end deliveries and issues associated with population growth such as increased road congestion. The report highlights a notable industry response, which has sought alternative methods of completing last-mile deliveries by transshipping goods from larger trunk vehicles to smaller delivery vehicles at consolidation hubs closer to population centres. At present, Cambridgeshire does not have a Freight Strategy or a Last-mile Strategy. Therefore, there is a gap in the consideration of last-mile logistics in the local area that local planning policy can begin to address.

6.15 Moreover, Cambridge's status as an historic city, featuring narrow streets and landmarks that are of significant historic value, is a strong consideration for the area's businesses and supply chain logistics. The centre of Cambridge includes pedestrian priority areas that restrict vehicular access and "no loading/no waiting" zones that can restrict logistics activities in the city. As noted by the study, these restrictions and limitations 'produce risks of high volumes of deliveries outside of restricted times, and increased costs for businesses in the city centres'. Similar issues are likely to arise in other settlements with special historic fabric across Greater Cambridge. Therefore, innovative, last-mile solutions that help to facilitate smaller-scale, sustainable modes of transport, such as cargo bikes and automated delivery robots, may play an important role in sustainable distribution, particularly in Greater Cambridge's built-up areas.

### **Lorry parking**

6.16 The report highlights that the existing distribution networks within the EEH centre around the "golden triangle" near Lutterworth, where the M1, M6 and A14 intersect. Although there is a direct connection between Cambridge and this sub-regional distribution centre, journey times from Cambridge to Lutterworth can take between 2-3 hours, making it challenging to achieve two or more HGV roundtrips per day. Driving distances, coupled with national shortages of spaces for lorries to park, present an area where improvements need to be made to improve the efficiency of logistics operations across the EEH.

6.17 There is a national shortage of spaces for lorries to park, particularly overnight. Drivers have to take rest periods, and the limits on driving time mean that spaces must be near to their destination or along the line of their route. Lack of spaces means that lorries either drive around looking for somewhere to park, or they park in ad hoc laybys or on streets. Such ad hoc parking does not provide drivers with decent facilities for eating, sleeping, or showering, is a source of complaint for local communities, and is insecure leading to the risk of increased crime.

6.18 "There is a serious shortage of HGV drivers in the UK (and much of Europe), and poor working conditions is one factor deterring new recruits". A similar

statement is presented later in the report, where it is noted that “[lack] of parking leads to (sic) lorries driving additional miles, complaints from residents and others impacted by unsuitable parking, and unacceptable conditions for lorry drivers (sic)” (paragraph 12.3.18).

6.19 To address this issue, the following recommendation is made with regards to lorry parking provision: “Planning Authorities within EEH should ensure that any new industrial development should have adequate good quality HGV parking facilities adjacent. If these do not already exist, then new HGV parking should be included as an integral part of the development”.

### **Delivery and servicing plans**

6.20 The report points to Delivery and Servicing Plans (DSPs) as a tool that can be used to understand on-site delivery and servicing needs during the planning phases of development, and that can be used to manage and monitor delivery and servicing operations during a development’s use. Other local planning authorities have introduced DSPs as a planning requirement and the EEH support the rollout of DSPs in planning across the sub-region: ‘EEH should work with local authorities to enable DSPs to become a planning requirement for every planning authority in the area’ (paragraph 12.6.10).

### **Greater Cambridge Employment and Housing Evidence Update (2022)**

6.21 The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service engaged Iceni Projects, Cambridge Econometrics and Justin Gardner Consulting to prepare an update to the Greater Cambridge Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence (ELEDs) 2020, and the related Greater Cambridge Housing & Employment Relationships Report (HERR) 2020.

6.22 The report analysed previous employment trends and commercial space forecasts to help identify how local planning policies could respond to changes in the local property and employment dynamics. The supply-demand patterns for industrial and warehouse space in Greater Cambridge was reviewed as part of the evidence update and the report suggests that there is an under-delivery of space for last-mile consolidation and customer fulfilment centres.

6.23 Increasingly stock is being taken up by the high demand mid-tech (flexible research and production space) sector, however this is crowding out space for warehousing and light industrial, both which have strong requirements, including for last mile delivery centres / customer fulfilment centres (a warehouse run by a third-party logistics (3PL) provider where customers orders are processed and delivered) for Cambridge residents.

#### **The Future of Last-Mile Deliveries: Understanding the Local Perspective (May 2022)**

6.24 The Local Government Association commissioned the University of West England's Centre for Transport and Society to prepare an independent assessment of the role of local authorities in the design and implementation of local freight solutions for last-mile cargo delivery. The study identified five primary challenges for current last-mile logistics:

- Increased traffic congestion and conflicts between road freight and other road users;
- Financial viability and support for alternative last-mile delivery models;
- The differences between urban and rural delivery needs;
- The significance of the scale of delivery needs in the UK;
- Ingrained consumer behaviours set following the increase in online shopping and remote communications.

6.25 The Study makes the following recommendations of relevance to this planning policy:

- Policymaking should support the introduction of micro-consolidation centres - small-scale facilities, located within or close to urban or neighbourhood centres, where parcels and other orders can be grouped before they are delivered to their final destination, to facilitate last-mile deliveries by smaller-scale, sustainable modes of travel such as cargo bikes;
- Policymakers should support the use of electric vehicles, including electric vans for bulkier goods, for deliveries to rural areas.

## **Greater Cambridge Warehouse and Industrial Space Needs (2025)**

6.26 The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service engaged Icen Projects, to prepare an additional evidence document to understand the warehousing and industrial space needs of the Greater Cambridge area. The report highlights a particular need for final-mile premises that are proximal to urban destinations to reduce journey times. Stakeholder contributions to the report highlighted a demand for last-mile distribution centres close to the strategic road network (SRN), with areas around Cambridge's fringe near the M11 or along the A14 or A428 corridors being viewed as potentially attractive locations for last-mile distribution centres.

6.27 In making recommendations for local planning policy, the following industry priorities are set out within the report for last-mile delivery premises in Greater Cambridge: "Typically locate on the edge of urban areas where access to both the SRN and local road network is good and journey distances are suitable for electric vehicles; in some instances, it will be possible and feasible for last mile facilities to be located on strategic logistics sites where these are at the edge of urban areas. The increased demand for more specific time slots and electric vehicles in dense urban areas promotes smaller facilities with all electric or bicycle delivery" (paragraph A2.6).

## **Draft policy and reasons**

6.28 The draft policy can be viewed in the Draft Local Plan.

6.29 Well-designed and managed delivery and servicing arrangements are key elements in ensuring that the impacts of a development on neighbouring residents or surrounding uses are minimised. This is a particularly important consideration for commercial development that is close to population centres and residential areas.

6.30 Traditional solutions such as off-street parking for commercial vehicles, dedicated loading and unloading areas, facilities and overnight parking for drivers, and sufficient room for lorry turning help to ensure that the delivery of

goods can be completed without causing significant issues for other road users and local residents, whilst also ensuring that site management and waste collection services can operate safely and efficiently.

6.31 Alternative delivery and servicing practices and emerging technologies also have an increasing role to play, for example: use of existing or provision of new micro-consolidation centres; re-timing of deliveries; smart or joint procurement measures; cargo bikes, cycle freight, electric and low or zero-emission vehicles; and delivery lockers in residential developments.

6.32 Last-mile deliveries offer an opportunity to reduce the road traffic impacts of delivery operations, whilst also mitigating the climate impacts of our supply chain logistics. Local planning policy can play a role in facilitating shifts towards more sustainable, last-mile delivery practices. Micro-consolidation centres (sometimes called last-mile hubs) are an alternative delivery solution that can help to mitigate the negative impacts of increased delivery movements. They are small-scale facilities, located within or close to urban or neighbourhood centres, where parcels and other orders can be grouped before they are delivered to their final destination. As such, micro-consolidation centres help to reduce the number of separate, individual deliveries that are made to homes and businesses.

6.33 Any site that receives deliveries or servicing activity can benefit from a Delivery Servicing Plan (DSP). A DSP is a logistics management tool for a development that can help to reduce the impacts of delivery and servicing activity at a site. An effective DSP incorporates a mixture of measures and typically includes:

- the physical design and layout of the site, and how it provides adequate provision for delivery and servicing activity from the commencement of the site's use;
- the day-to-day policies and measures that will be implemented so that deliveries and servicing are appropriately managed, and how the local disruption and environmental impacts of that activity will be minimised over time. It should set appropriate targets for continuous improvement;

- the forecast trip rates for the site.

6.34 The draft policy approach set out within Policy I/FD of the First Proposals has been refined to focus on facilitating safe and efficient delivery consolidation and on-site servicing through the design process; Greater Cambridge's strategic freight consolidation and distribution needs have been addressed by the Draft Local Plan Strategy and other Local Plan policies, or they are a matter for the local transport authority to consider as part of their transport plans.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

6.35 The First Proposals policy direction proposed seeking opportunities to reduce the number of freight and servicing vehicles and their environmental impact on Greater Cambridge, particularly at peak times, while promoting movement of freight by rail and sustainable transport modes.

6.36 Whilst continuing to seek reductions in the environmental impacts of deliveries and servicing, an alternative approach now considered is to address freight requirements elsewhere in the Draft Plan and through local transport plans.

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

6.37 Support for the general policy approach, particularly the move towards sustainable modes of transport for last-mile deliveries, has been noted. The Councils agree that the perspectives of stakeholders operating in the logistics sectors will be important in shaping appropriate logistics facilities in the area. The Local Plan will be subject to various rounds of consultation where stakeholders can provide further comments on the approach to planning policy, and stakeholders will be able to provide their views on site-specific proposals through the planning application process itself.

6.38 The Councils also recognise and appreciate that modal shifts away from road freight vehicles towards more sustainable means of transportation will play a significant role in helping to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and local road traffic. The policy provides explicit support for sustainable, innovative approaches

to last-mile deliveries such as providing facilities as part of consolidation centres that support the use of cargo bikes or electric vehicles. The draft plan has responded to the opportunities provided by rail. The movement of freight is also a matter for the local transport authority to consider in their transport plans. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership have commenced work on freight strategies for Cambridgeshire.

6.39 The Councils' approach to freight consolidation has been informed by the various studies and strategic actions discussed above. The evidence indicates that efficiency improvements to local logistics activities could be improved through enhanced micro-consolidation and macro-consolidation facilities. The preferred policy approach seeks to support new micro-consolidation centres given the need for sustainable last-mile facilities in Greater Cambridge. In addition, the need for employment land for logistics and distribution has been considered through the employment needs evidence. Allocations are proposed in response to this need.

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

6.40 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.

## 7. Policy I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure

### Issue the plan is seeking to respond to

7.1 Greater Cambridge has an expansive infrastructure network that helps support many important functions both nationally and locally. It is considered important that infrastructure is protected from development proposals that would adversely affect the utility of important infrastructure.

### How the issue was covered in the First Proposals consultation

7.2 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [First Proposals Policy I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure](#).

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

### Policy context update

7.4 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 Infrastructure Topic Paper (2021).

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

7.5 A variety of organisations expressed support for the policy's direction. The policy was supported by the Environment Agency, who also noted that they expected safeguarding to include what is required for water infrastructure more broadly (water supply and waste), green infrastructure and biodiversity. The University of Cambridge supported the intention to continue to safeguard research at the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge.

7.6 Anglian Water Services Ltd requested that GCSP considers safeguarding land in the next stages of the Local Plan for new infrastructure, possibly including a

recognition of the need for the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plan relocation. The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) which is linked to the Ministry of Defence, stated that Bassingbourn Barracks should be identified as safeguarded infrastructure to support its ongoing defence needs and protect it from being impacted by external development. The DIO suggested that GCSP should consider including a specific planning policy to deliver this. DIO also stressed the importance of safeguarding the airspace above Cambridge airport and keeping it free from obstruction. The DIO also noted that the Plan needs to ensure that new development does not disrupt their technical asset 'East 2 WAM Network' which contributes to aviation safety by feeding into the air traffic management system.

7.7 Marshall criticised the policy for not mentioning water infrastructure and did not perceive the Lord's Bridge Telescope to be important infrastructure. I Butnar asserted that the rail infrastructure plans are not ambitious enough and instead the policy should place a greater emphasis upon how the provision of station can help neighbouring communities thrive. Steeple Morden Parish Council suggested including disused railway lines for potential infrastructure needs.

7.8 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**

7.14 No new or updated evidence.

### **Recommendations from the sustainability appraisal**

7.15 The sustainability appraisal stated that the first proposal policy approach would be preferred as there is a need to safeguard important infrastructure so that it works effectively or can be brought back into use in future. The alternative of having no policy was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it would risk jeopardising important infrastructure.

## Draft policy and reasons

7.16 The draft policy can be viewed in the Draft Local Plan.

7.17 Greater Cambridge has an expansive infrastructure network that helps support many important functions both nationally and locally. It is important that infrastructure is protected from development proposals that would adversely affect their operation.

7.18 Rail has an important role in the movement of freight. There is a general acceptance that the transfer of freight from road to rail will provide significant environmental improvement and will help to develop sustainable distribution. There are a number of railway sidings within Greater Cambridge, which either are used, or have the potential to be used in the future and are therefore require safeguarding. Following engagement with Network Rail, the list of safeguarded sidings has been updated to ensure only those with the potential for future use are safeguarded.

7.19 Although the Local Plan anticipates the Cambridge Airport site being redeveloped, whilst it remains operational planning decisions must take full account of safety requirements. Planning decisions affecting Duxford Aerodrome must also take full account of safety requirements. Engagement with the operator of Cambridge Airport has confirmed that the existing Local Plan Policy and safeguarding zones continue to be fit for purpose.

7.20 The internationally important Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge contains unique radio and optical telescopes which are highly susceptible to many forms of interference, specifically electrical interference, light pollution and mechanical vibration. Engagement with the University has highlighted the importance of policy measures to protect operations at Lord Bridge and that the existing Local Plan Policy and Consultation Areas continue to be fit for purpose. Therefore, arrangements will continue to be made to consult the University of Cambridge about the technical consequences for the observatory of proposed development.

7.21 Engagement with Defence Infrastructure Organisation, following on from their representation at first proposals, has identified Bassingbourn Barracks and Barton Road Rifle Range as sites that play a role in supporting national defence activities. National planning policy sets out that planning policies should recognise, and support development required for operational defence and security purposes. As per national planning policy, the draft local plan will protect these operational defence sites from adverse impacts that may arise from other developments.

7.22 The Defence Infrastructure Organisation has also highlighted that the East 2 WAM Network contributes to aviation safety by feeding into the air traffic management system in the Eastern areas of England. There is the potential for development to impact on the operation and/or capability of this new technical asset which consists of nodes and connecting pathways. In line with the safeguarding map provided by the DIO which provides the geographic extent of the safeguarding zones and the criteria associated with them, the draft local plan will require development proposals which are located within a consultation zone and trigger the relevant criteria to be subject to consultation with the MOD.

7.23 In order to safeguard the East 2 WAM network, development proposals within the East 2 WAM Network safeguarding areas, will be the subject of consultation with the MOD where development triggers the consultation requirement of the safeguarding area. Planning permission will be refused where interference to the East 2 WAM Network would be caused that could not be overcome by conditions or by the use of planning obligations.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

7.24 No additional alternative approaches identified.

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

7.25 Multiple stakeholders who own or operate infrastructure made representations highlighting the manner in which their infrastructure should be safeguarded. In response, stakeholders have been contacted to assess appropriate

safeguarding options which have been implemented into the policy wherever possible. Where infrastructure has been covered by policy within the existing local plans, infrastructure operators have been directly consulted to ascertain whether the existing safeguarding policy adequately safeguards the relevant infrastructure.

7.26 The Environment Agency made a representation suggesting flood risk infrastructure should be safeguarded and that the SFRA evidence base can inform the identification of flood risk infrastructure for safeguarding. Beyond the functional floodplain, the SFRA does not identify any specific flood risk infrastructure for safeguarding. It is considered that policy CC/FM will adequately manage any development which would affect the integrity of flood risk infrastructure.

7.27 Anglian Water reference the potential for safeguarding the location identified for the relocated Cambridge Treatment Works. Subsequently the site has gained a Development Consent Order. Safeguarding waste site is a matter for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

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

7.28 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.

## 8. Policy I/AD: Aviation development

### Issue the plan is seeking to respond to

8.1 There are a number of active airfields in Greater Cambridge, and the plan needs to ensure that safety issues are fully considered, particularly when new development is proposed in their vicinity. The Local Plan also needs to provide a policy framework for considering proposals for airfield development and use, including to ensure amenity impacts are fully considered.

### How the issue was covered in the First Proposals consultation

8.2 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [First Proposals Policy I/AD: Aviation development](#).

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

### Policy context update

8.4 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 Infrastructure Topic Paper (2021).

### Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

8.5 A limited number of representations were received to this policy. A few parish councils expressed general support for the policy. There were some criticisms of the policy: Cambridgeshire County Council questioned the wording of the policy, specifically the implication that aviation would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties also argued that, due to environmental concerns, the policy should support no development of the airport except under exceptional circumstances. Contrastingly, D Lister perceived the balance of the Plan to be weighted too far

towards protecting other parties from aviation and does not do enough to protect airfields.

8.6 There were some suggestions to improve the policy: Imperial War Museum and Gonville and Caius College argued that the proposed policy does not consider Policy TI/5 from South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan and stated that the Local Plan needed to align with policy proposals from Civil Aviation Authority. Steeple Morden Parish Council argued that the Local Plan should recognise the need for a national network of general airfields.

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

8.7 No new or updated evidence.

### **Draft policy and reasons**

8.8 The draft policy can be viewed in the Draft Local Plan.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

8.9 No additional alternative approaches identified.

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

8.10 The National Planning Policy Framework requires planning policies to recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the General Aviation Strategy. The draft policy recognises their economic benefits, and with the application of this policy and the policies within the wider plan will allow their adaptation whilst considering environmental impacts.

## Further work and next steps

- 8.11 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.

## 9. Policy I/El: Energy infrastructure masterplanning

### Issue the plan is seeking to respond to

- 9.1 Work carried out to assess electricity grid capacity for Greater Cambridge has highlighted the need to increase capacity to support the current growth agenda and electrification of transport. The electricity grid serving the Greater Cambridge area has seen a significant growth in renewable and low carbon energy generation as part of the wider growth agenda. Major new developments are often accompanied by new energy generation capacity in order to meet carbon reduction requirements and, in some cases, to meet funding requirements. The transition to net zero carbon is also placing new pressures on electricity infrastructure, with the electrification of heat and transport all leading to a need for reinforcement and additional capacity on the grid.
- 9.2 While these capacity issues can be resolved through traditional grid reinforcement routes, there are opportunities to take a more joined up approach to infrastructure provision in order to support the transition to a net zero carbon society and open up the potential for some infrastructure to be forward funded to help speed up the delivery of key development sites. Such an approach will also help support UK Power Networks (UKPN), the local network operator, in making plans for future investment. There may also be a role for the public sector to help forward fund some infrastructure, which will need to be informed by an understanding of demand, capacity and the extent to which grid reinforcement is required.

## **How the issue was covered in the First Proposals consultation**

9.3 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [First Proposals Policy I/El: Energy infrastructure masterplanning](#).

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

## **Policy context update**

9.5 There have been no changes to the national or local policy context from that which informed the First Proposals, as set out in the Infrastructure Topic Paper (2021).

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

9.6 There were many comments expressing support for the policy. A few respondents added caveats to their support: Carbon Neutral Cambridge wanted the policy strengthened to require developers to contribute to the costs of improving the power grid and others argued that smart localised energy systems should be the new norm, no matter the size of new development and that new development provides an opportunity to bring this service to existing developments.

9.7 Some comments criticised the policy; Persimmon Homes East Midlands argued that clarification is required on the definition of an energy masterplan and the outcomes of these should be fully considered within any viability assessment. D Blake stated that the policy mentions digital systems but omits discussion of water supply, sewage, gas, and hydrogen. Metro Property Unit Trust stated that the policy only sets requirements for households and should also set the requisite non-residential floorspace threshold, including whether thresholds/exemptions for other types of applicable accommodation. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties stated that the threshold should be based on impact, not scale. R Pargeter stated that the policy focusses on new development, but a significant

increase in electric cars is likely to require grid reinforcement, especially in rural locations, even in the absence of any new site developments.

9.8 A few comments wanted to change the scope of the policy. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC argued that the timespan for these changes should be brought forward in anticipation of new demand from new railways. D Lister stated that the plan should consider the role of a distributed grid of micro generation, not just large power station supply and substation infrastructure. Cambridge Past, Present & Future states that there needs to be committed way forward for strategic electrical energy supply planning.

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

9.9 Work is currently underway to develop a Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan, which will help provide additional evidence of the grid infrastructure upgrades required to support the levels of growth envisaged in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. This will help to identify areas where additional infrastructure or upgrades to existing infrastructure is required, identify high level costings for this work and develop a pipeline of priority projects. Outputs are expected in late 2025/early 2026.

### **Draft policy and reasons**

9.10 The draft policy can be viewed in the Draft Local Plan.

9.11 Work carried out to assess electricity grid capacity for Greater Cambridge has highlighted the need to triple capacity to support the development planned in the area under existing local plans and support the electrification of transport. The electricity grid serving the area has also seen a significant growth in renewable and low carbon energy generation. Major new developments are often accompanied by new energy generation capacity to meet carbon reduction and in some cases funding requirements. The transition to net zero carbon is also placing new pressures on electricity infrastructure, with the electrification of heat and transport all leading to a need for reinforcement and additional capacity on the grid.

9.12 While these capacity issues can be resolved through traditional grid reinforcement routes, there are opportunities to take a more joined up approach to infrastructure provision in order to support the transition to a net zero carbon society and open up the potential for some infrastructure to be forward funded to help speed up the delivery of key development sites. Work is currently underway to develop a digital Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan, which will identify the infrastructure required to support growth and decarbonisation across the area, data that will be shared with UK Power Networks to help inform their business planning. This assessment will be at a strategic level and will present a picture of capacity at a moment in time. As more detailed work on masterplanning of strategic developments progresses, greater clarity can be provided as to the actual energy requirements and the infrastructure required to support development, data that can be used to keep the Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan up to date and inform UKPN business planning.

9.13 This policy seeks to ensure that this approach is integrated at a very early stage, via the development of energy masterplans for strategic developments. This approach can also help to support the funding of such infrastructure, for example as was the case for the provision of new infrastructure to support the development of the Cambridge East Grid and Trumpington Primary Sub Station. In this instance, working with the [Greater Cambridge Partnership](#), evidence was developed for submission to Ofgem to demonstrate the capacity requirements generated by growth to the south of Cambridge and the level of jobs growth that the provision of new infrastructure would provide, unlocking full Ofgem funding for the new infrastructure.

9.14 A grid capacity study and energy masterplan has already been developed for the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan. This work considered the energy requirements of the North East Cambridge development, current capacity of the primary sub-station serving the area, options to deliver the necessary reinforcement of that sub-station and the energy options to support the development of that site. Studies for strategic developments could follow a similar format.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

9.15 No additional alternative approaches identified.

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

9.16 A number of respondents requested clarification on the definition of an energy masterplan and the need for the outcomes of these to be fully considered within any viability assessment. Further detail on the content of energy masterplans along with the scale of development that they will be required for has now been added to the policy. With regards to impact on viability, the Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan will include costings of the infrastructure required to support growth, which will be fed into the viability work that will accompany the Local Plan.

9.17 Representations were also received suggesting that the policy should also include water, although consideration of water infrastructure is included within policy I/ID: Infrastructure and Delivery. There were also comments about the scope of the policy and the thresholds at which the policy should apply, and the policy has been updated to clarify the thresholds for both residential and non-residential development. While there was some call for the policy to be based on impact instead of scale, at present the threshold for the preparation of energy masterplans is based on number of new homes and non-residential floorspace. This is in recognition that for many schemes, the exact level of energy requirements may not be known at the application stage.

9.18 Comments were also received regarding the need to also consider the impact of the impacts of the significant increase in electric cars on the need for grid reinforcement, especially in rural locations, even in the absence of any new site developments. The impact of the electrification of transport is being considered as part of the Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan, which will look at both the requirements of new development but also the increase of electric vehicles across Cambridgeshire. This plan will identify where further grid reinforcements are planned and will help to inform UK Power Networks business plans.

9.19 Some comments requested a change of scope of the policy, for example bringing forward the timespan in anticipation of new demand from railways, giving consideration to the role of a distributed grid of micro generation and the need for a committed way for strategic energy supply planning. While these issues sit outside the remit of a local plan, they will be considered as part of the Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan, which is currently under development and due for publication late 2025/early 2026. It should be noted that this document will not be a static document but a digital plan that will be kept up to date as new projects are identified, helping to identify the costs associated with upgrading the energy system to support net zero carbon and growth, and helping to inform UK Power Networks business planning. The Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan will also inform the Regional Energy Spatial Plans currently under development by the National Energy System Operator (NESO). The Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan will form part of the evidence base for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan and will inform viability work.

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

9.20 Review the comments received on the draft Local Plan prior to preparing the proposed submission version, alongside the outputs of the Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan or changes to national or local policy.

## 10. Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery

### Issue the plan is seeking to respond to

- 10.1 There is a need to ensure new development does not place unacceptable pressure on existing community facilities, such as local healthcare, schools, libraries, outdoor and indoor sports facilities, and open spaces.
- 10.2 Policy is needed to ensure new development makes provision for new facilities and services to meet a development's needs to make a development acceptable in planning terms and deliver sustainable communities.
- 10.3 The Local Plan needs to ensure that infrastructure is available at the right time to mitigate the impacts of new development. The Local Plan needs to identify what is needed, when, and how it will be funded. This includes seeking appropriate funding of infrastructure by developers responding to the needs generated by their developments.

### How the issue was covered in the First Proposals consultation

- 10.4 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [First Proposals Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and Delivery](#).
- 10.5 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: [First Proposals Infrastructure Topic Paper](#).

### Policy context update

- 10.6 Beyond the change to vision-led approach to sustainable transport – already highlighted earlier to Policy I/ST - there have been no changes to the national or local policy context informing infrastructure planning from that which informed the First Proposals and is set out in the Infrastructure Topic Paper (2021).

10.7 The new NPPF continues to promote the use of S106 obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy to secure and fund the provision of new infrastructure.

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

10.8 Some respondents expressed general support for the policy, although a few added caveats to their support. The Wildlife Trust stated that greater emphasis should be placed on funding strategic natural greenspace and green infrastructure which needed to be delivered with explicit funding mechanisms outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties stated that the policy should include penalties for not delivering on infrastructure commitments.

10.9 Some respondents criticised the policy; D Lister stated that thresholds for contribution to infrastructure should be replaced as it allows for developments to be sized just under the threshold to avoid contributions. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group stated that funding must be consistently leveraged through developer contributions for health and care services to meet growing demand.

10.10 Cambridgeshire County Council expressed a preference for contributions towards educational facilities to be sought through S106. The Education & Skills Funding Agency of Department for Education posted a substantial representation and made many points, including their request that the Plan identifies specific sites that can deliver school places to support growth based on the latest Infrastructure Delivery Plan, that viability assessment inform options analysis and site selection in the district, and they recommend that to pass the soundness test of 'effectiveness', the Plan should ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to deliver the school places required to meet the increase in demand generated by new developments.

10.11 A few respondents argued that the scope of infrastructure provided for in the Local Plan should be widened. North Hertfordshire District Council requested that GCSP shares data with them to understand the potential impact of

Cambridge South Railway Station. Suffolk County Council provided a substantial representation which emphasised the importance of cross-boundary working on a number of key planning issues, such as transport and green infrastructure and the need to ensure that planning obligations can be used to mitigate impacts upon neighbouring authorities.

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

- 10.12 The draft Greater Cambridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been updated. The updated IDP has assessed the infrastructure required across the Greater Cambridge area required to support the proposed spatial development plan, including identifying specific infrastructure needs of strategic growth sites.
- 10.13 A key to delivering sustainable development is aligning infrastructure provision with growth. The IDP has had regard to the total quantum of development planned, to ensure gross development needs are assessed, but is particularly focused on the infrastructure required during the plan period, when it is needed, how much it will cost, and how it will be funded.
- 10.14 Importantly, the IDP identifies the infrastructure that remains unfunded and where development contributions may be required to adequately mitigate the impacts of proposed development.
- 10.15 A new Viability Assessment has been undertaken of the Local Plan, that demonstrates development can afford the policy requirements expected of the development proposed to come forward through the new Local Plan and generate a surplus to contribute towards infrastructure needs. It has had regard to variations in values across the area, drawing on local evidence.

### **Draft policy and reasons**

- 10.16 The draft policy can be viewed in the Draft Local Plan.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

- 10.17 No additional alternative approaches identified.

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

- 10.18 In recognition that the proposed policies of the draft Development Plan have been the subject of viability assessment, the policy has been amended to include a policy on viability to account for circumstance where a developer is seeking to make a case that their development proposal is not be able to meet the relevant policy requirements and infrastructure needs and remain viable. In such instances, the onus is on the applicant to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate the site-specific circumstances that mean the policies and infrastructure requirements cannot be met in full, including the options considered and assessed to try and bring the development into compliance.
- 10.19 The new policy on viability requires the applicant to submit a viability assessment with their planning application. However, due to the technical nature of such assessments, the Council will require external expertise to review this and confirm whether the assumptions and conclusions reach are valid. The cost of having the development viability independently assessed is a burden resulting from the development application, and therefore the policy clarifies that this cost should be met by the applicant.
- 10.20 To ensure developers do not seek to avoid triggering applicable thresholds by developing out sites piecemeal, a new policy has been introduced that ensures the wider site will be assessed in terms of capacity and infrastructure needs.
- 10.21 A further policy has been added to require the submission of a utilities statement for all major planning applications. The intention of the policy is to confirm that the essential utilities infrastructure can and will be available to serve the development at the time it is intended to be delivered and subsequently occupied.

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

- 10.22 The common issue raised on the draft policy was that it was not detailed enough about a specific form of infrastructure the individual respondent was

concerned with. However, this is not easily addressed, as requirements will vary on a site-by-site basis, informed by a range of policies and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The policy has been amended to be clear that the Councils expect development proposals to meet relevant development plan requirements in full on site through the design led approach and to contribute towards strategic infrastructure as identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

10.23 The reference to the 'relevant development plan requirements' avoids the need to list the out the infrastructure types in this policy as the relevant policies e.g. on green infrastructure, education, or community facilities, will provide clarity on the scope of the infrastructure items to be defined under each, and will set out the policy requirements to be met by new development and the form of any obligation, including whether off-site provision or a financial contribution in lieu is acceptable. This is preferable approach than seeking to cover this under the one infrastructure policy which would be unable to recognise and account for any nuances between different forms of infrastructure.

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

10.24 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.

## 11. Policy I/DT: Digital and telecommunications infrastructure

### Issue the plan is seeking to respond to

- 11.1 The growth of connectivity over the last decade has resulted in digital technologies becoming increasingly prominent in almost every aspect of modern living, meaning that demand for ever faster global connectivity is only expected to increase. Greater Cambridge's economy is driven by knowledge-based sectors with companies that rely on the use of cutting-edge digital technology. It is vital for the continued success of these companies and, subsequently for the Greater Cambridge economy, that they have the connectivity they need to perform.
- 11.2 It is important to recognise that companies across all sectors benefit from good connectivity to digital infrastructure and a strong telecommunications network connectivity. The importance of good connectivity across the economy has been amplified by the behavioural changes to working and consumption practices catalysed by the COVID-19 Pandemic. These changes have seen a significant rise in flexible working arrangements and the number of people working from home. Access to digital technology in the home and community is also a vital component of social inclusion: the absence of digital connectivity can impact on the educational, employment, financial and health outcomes of individuals and families by limiting their access to information or opportunities to participate. This can lead to social isolation and digital poverty.
- 11.3 There is a need to ensure that connectivity in Greater Cambridge supports existing and future demand to not only support good Internet and mobile phone access for residents and businesses, but also to provide a platform for "smart" technologies, including environmental monitoring and management, energy efficiency and future transport solutions.

## How the issue was covered in the First Proposals consultation

11.4 A policy approach was proposed in the First Proposals consultation. The Proposed approach and full representations received can be viewed here: [First Proposals Policy I/DI: Digital infrastructure](#).

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

## Policy context update

### [Building Regulations. Approved Document R \(December 2022\)](#)

11.6 The Building etc. (Amendment) (England) (No. 2) Regulations 2022 introduced changes to the Building Regulations in December 2022. Of relevance to digital infrastructure is [Approved Document R: Infrastructure for Electronic Communications](#), which requires all new homes to have a connection to a gigabit-capable public electronics communications network unless exemptions apply (i.e. the cost of introducing such gigabit connections would be unviable or an agreement cannot be reached with network operators can provide a gigabit capable connection). Where a gigabit-capable connection cannot be delivered, either because it cannot be agreed with network operators or the provision of such a connection would exceed the stated cost cap, developers are required to provide the next fastest, available digital connection.

### [Connectivity - Building World-Class Digital Infrastructure for the UK \(Updated September 2023\)](#)

11.7 In September 2023, the Government updated their policy paper on connectivity. The policy continues to prioritise the rollout of ultrafast broadband services and 5G mobile connectivity to ensure businesses and communities can engage smart technologies that have rapidly integrated into day-to-day life. The policy recognises that next generation connectivity can be delivered through a range of technologies, including mobile, wireless and satellite connections, fixed-line broadband networks, and community-scale infrastructure such as small cell technology. Changes to the planning system

and the regulatory environment continue to be recognised as an accelerant in the delivery of greater digital and communications connectivity for communities and businesses, as well as ensuring our homes and workplaces can be adapted to changes in technology (e.g. the [Prime Minister's opening speech for the London Tech Week 2025](#)).

#### **Digital Inclusion Delivery Plan 2024-25 (June 2024)**

11.18 Connecting Cambridgeshire unveiled work on their Digital Inclusion Delivery Plan to combat local exclusion from smart technology and digital networks. Six key principles underpin the Digital Inclusion Delivery Plan: (1) better engagement; (2) place-based solutions; (3) better use of funding and social value; (4) collaborative and partnership working; (5) creative and innovative problem-solving; and (6) integration of smart technology into local authority working.

11.19 In addition to planning for financial support and skills training, Connecting Cambridgeshire hold an ambition to widen the availability of CambWifi – the County Council's publicly accessible Wi-Fi network – and support the introduction of connectivity hubs across Cambridgeshire (e.g. within community centres or community business hubs). The County Council have recognised the need to prepare for the Digital Switchover from Public Switched Telephone Network, 2G and 3G networks, which will require suitable infrastructure to be delivered ahead of the Digital Switchover to ensure minimal disruption to residents and businesses and prevent worsening digital exclusion in Greater Cambridge. Further information on the Digital Switchover

#### **National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)**

11.20 The NPPF was updated in December 2024. The NPPF's support for high-quality communications infrastructure across England, including infrastructure to support next generation 5G mobile connectivity, remains unchanged.

#### **AI Opportunities Action Plan (January 2025)**

11.21 The Government holds an ambitious vision for Britain to be a pioneer in artificial intelligence (AI) development, recognising the country's position as the

third largest AI market in the world. The academic expertise and research in the AI space that has grown in Cambridge is a recognised growth area as part of the Government's AI development vision. Physical infrastructure and data centres are needed to provide the energy, connectivity and storage capabilities needed for advancement in the AI space. As such, the AI Opportunities Action Plan highlights that positive planning and a strategic development position on mobile and digital infrastructure are needed to provide virtual technology with the foundation it needs to advance.

### **Moving Landlines to Digital Technologies (May 2025)**

11.22 In November 2017, the telecommunications industry announced that legacy telephone networks that rely on traditional landline infrastructure will be retired, and that telecommunications industry will be digitally led. This is often referred to as the Digital Switchover. The PTSN is planned to be switched off by January 2027, requiring infrastructure upgrades for any services and systems that rely on legacy telecommunications infrastructure. Switching and upgrade services are being provided by communications providers, but improvements in network access and connectivity capability will be needed if this transition is to be supported sustainably.

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

11.23 Some organisations expressed general support for the policy, with a few organisations such as Carbon Neutral Cambridge emphasising its importance. Some parish councils stated that there was a need for enhancement of mobile phone coverage in villages with poor reception by well sited and suitably camouflaged masts.

11.24 Trumpington Residents Association stated that there was a need for the GCSP to ensure that the policy is properly implemented so that residents have connectivity when they move into new homes. Respondents criticised the policy, stating that the wording of the policy provides a loophole for developers and instead the policy should mandate that new developments have at least 1 gigabit per second connectivity. They also stated that it should be mandated

that developers supply Category 6 network points in every room in new dwellings to allow hard wiring equipment. Cambridge Past, Present & Future also criticised the policy stating that it was disappointing that developers are not required to consider gigabit connections at all sites and that Cambridgeshire needs to support the delivery of gigabit connections in areas where fibre connections are not cost effective.

- 11.25 A few developers asked for confirmation in relation to whether all development is required to provide a 'Connectivity Statements', or whether the policy direction is intended for major developments. If the latter, floorspace, and dwelling thresholds should be stated, to provide applicants with clarity. Some other developers argued that it is important that the eventual policy wording recognises to what degree digital infrastructure is under the control of the developer themselves as opposed to statutory bodies. Linked to this, the Home Builders Federation argued that the Council should not impose new electronic communications requirements beyond the provision of infrastructure as set out in statutory Building Regulations. Further detail, including where to view the full representations and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement.

## **New or updated evidence base**

### **Experiences of digital exclusion among temporary accommodation and social housing tenants: Learning for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Digital Inclusion Delivery Plan**

- 11.26 The University of Cambridge's Centre for Housing and Planning Research published a research paper on digital exclusion amongst residents of temporary accommodation and social housing. Participants of the study highlighted that the lack of accessible, stable digital connectivity can lead to barriers to financial support or public services that exist if the quality of digital and telecommunications network connectivity is poor. Issues highlighted by participants included financial support barriers due to an inability to access the Universal Credit portal, and barriers to medical and police services. The study's recommendations note that tackling digital exclusion is a strategic issue that

will require collaboration between actors in the public and private sectors, and an acknowledgment of the differences between connectivity in public places and connectivity at home.

#### **Digital Inclusion in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: A Study of Limited Internet Use and Proxy Internet Use**

11.27 The University of Cambridge's Centre for Housing and Planning Research published a research paper on limited internet use and proxy internet use across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to build an understanding of digital inclusion and digital participation in the area. The research highlights the importance of community venues, such as libraries, community centres and community community-embedded organisations, to provide digital access and support.

#### **Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study: Life Science and ICT Locational, Land and Accommodation Needs**

11.28 IcenI have prepared a study on the key economic sectors driving growth in Greater Cambridge. Stakeholders, particularly from the IT and technical sectors, stated that having access to fast broadband and strong network connectivity was a requirement for their economic operations. The study concludes that, 'Greater Cambridge has a unique role to play on the national and international scale in life science and ICT evolution but will need to continue to evolve its offer to compete on the national and international scale'. Building strong connectivity in Greater Cambridge's, including next-generation digital and telecommunications capabilities, are highlighted as development priorities to help ensure the area can maintain a competitive economic edge.

#### **Draft Policy and reasons**

11.29 The draft policy can be viewed in the Draft Local Plan.

11.30 The COVID-19 Pandemic introduced significant systemic changes to the way that many industries and employees work. Trend analysis conducted by the [House of Commons Library](#) on remote and hybrid working noted that, whilst the

number of people working in remote working arrangements showed signs of decline following the Pandemic, employers and employees anticipated that hybrid working arrangements would likely remain stable in the years after the COVID-19 Pandemic. This prediction has been supported by analysis on hybrid working published by the [Office for National Statistics](#) (ONS) in November 2024, which illustrates a marginal increase in the number of hybrid workers in the UK since January 2021.

- 11.31 Hybrid working in the UK has been shown by the ONS to be more pronounced in the information and communication (IT) sector, the professional, scientific and technical sector (which includes research and development activities), and the education sector. The [Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study: Life Science and ICT Locational, Land and Accommodation Needs](#) prepared by Iceni in 2024 highlights that these sectors are dominant within the Greater Cambridge economic landscape. These economic sectors are likely to continue to play a critical role in Greater Cambridge's economy due to the economic clustering around Cambridge's well-established higher education and research and development institutions. Therefore, having sufficient communications infrastructure will be necessary to ensure that Greater Cambridge can continue to be an attractive destination for employers in these sectors, and the area's innovation and growth is to be functionally sustainable.
- 11.32 In November 2023, Central Government announced [funding for a series of regional projects](#) that aimed to deliver 5G connectivity boosts across the UK. This included funding for [England's Connected Heartland](#), a "5G Innovation Region" that encompasses Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Berkshire, Central Bedfordshire, and Cambridgeshire. The regional vision seeks to introduce advanced wireless connectivity, which includes 5G technology, satellite communication capabilities and long-range communication technologies, to drive forward regional innovation and service efficiencies. Local planning policy will have a role to play in ensuring that infrastructure delivery in new developments aligns with wider regional aspirations and supports growth in communication technology advancement in ways that are sympathetic to the character and needs of Greater Cambridge.

11.33 An independent survey of mobile network coverage commissioned by Cambridgeshire County Council has indicated that, whilst there is good 4G coverage across most of Greater Cambridge, additional infrastructure rollout is still needed across Greater Cambridge to improve accessibility to good 5G indoor coverage (see Table 1a and 1b).

**Table 1a: 4G Indoor Coverage in Greater Cambridge**

% of Greater Cambridge with good coverage from at least one provider	% of Greater Cambridge with good coverage from all providers	% of area not covered by any operator
93.9%	59.0%	6.1%

**Table 1b: 5G Indoor Coverage in Greater Cambridge**

% of Greater Cambridge with good coverage from at least one provider	% of Greater Cambridge with good coverage from all providers	% of area not covered by any operator
68%	0.4%	32.2%

Source: Cambridgeshire County Council (2025)

11.34 Whilst broadly consistent with the policy direction for Policy I/DI (as published in the First Proposals), the policy direction has undergone some refinements to reflect changes in planning and policymaking context. The title of the policy has been changed to Policy I/DT: Digital and Telecommunications Infrastructure to make it clear that the policy concerns both digital and telecommunications development. Refinements have also been made to planning application submission requirements when compared to the First Proposals given the introduction of Approved Document R of The Building Regulations, which sets out gigabit-connection requirements for new dwellings.

## **Additional alternative approaches considered**

11.35 No additional alternative approaches identified.

## Response to main issues raised in representations

- 11.36 In developing the policy, the councils have sought to make digital connectivity requirements for new development clear, outlining that a gigabit capable connection (i.e. connectivity speeds of at least 1 gigabit per second) should be delivered unless an agreement cannot be reached with network operators to provide such a connection. The councils recognise the need for the policy to be clear when requirements will take effect and how applicants should demonstrate compliance with stated policy requirements. Thresholds for development floorspace or the number of units have been built into the policy for small-cell technology requirements or for when network coverage will need to be assessed. Furthermore, Connectivity Plans will not be a planning requirement for new dwellings as they are already a requirement of Approved Document R of The Building Regulations. However, the councils will expect planning applications to be accompanied by correspondence with both digital and telecommunications network operators to confirm how the proposed development will be connected, and details of how digital and telecommunications infrastructure, including cabinets, ducting and masts, have been integrated into the wider placemaking strategy for the proposed development. Requirements have been set out within the policy and guidance on how to demonstrate compliance with these policy requirements has been provided within the supporting text.
- 11.37 The position adopted by the councils does not conflict with the position adopted by the Building Regulations Approved Document R and is considered to be in alignment with Government plans to ensure that the country's homes and places of work are equipped with next-generation communications infrastructure. The policy approach taken by the councils seeks to ensure that new non-residential development also benefits from the same level of digital connectivity as new homes to ensure that businesses in Greater Cambridge will also benefit from reliable, high-speed network connectivity.

## **Further work and next steps**

- 11.38 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.

## **12. Policy I/CM: Construction management**

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

- 12.1 Construction of new developments can adversely affect the amenity of surrounding occupiers and the local environment through the generation of traffic, noise, smells and dust. The construction process for any new development also utilises a significant amount of natural resources and generates construction waste and spoil. This policy sets out requirements for Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMPs) to ensure that construction methods are sustainable and do not cause irreversible harm to environments and neighbouring communities.

### **How the issue was covered in the First Proposals consultation**

- 12.2 Policy requirements for CEMPs were included within the First Proposals as part of Policy CC/CE: Reducing Waste and Supporting the Circular Economy. However, in order to maintain Policy CC/CE's focus on circular economy principles, it was decided that requirements for CEMPs, which cover aspects of construction management and pollution control beyond sustainable waste and resource management, were best addressed by a separate policy.
- 12.3 The First Proposals was supported by topic papers, which explored the context, evidence and potential alternatives and the preferred approach in greater detail: [Climate Change Topic Paper](#).

## **Policy context update**

### **National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)**

12.4 The NPPF was updated in December 2024. National planning policy requirements directly relevant to the need to manage construction activity appropriately are:

- Paragraph 187 of the NPPF, which notes that planning policies and decisions should mitigate against the introduction of contaminated or unstable land where possible.
- Paragraph 198 of the NPPF, which highlights that, '[planning] policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development'.

#### **Natural Environment National Planning Practice Guidance (updated in June 2025)**

12.5 The role that the planning system can play in safeguarding natural capital has been laid out in the Government's national planning practice guidance (NPPG) on the Natural Environment. Soils are an important natural asset, and the quality of soil plays a critical role in the balance of ecosystems and in a place's overall environmental health. The NPPG refers to DEFRA's [Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites](#), which contains guidance on how topsoil and subsoils imported to a site or extracted on site during construction should be managed and stored. These soil management guidelines can be integrated as part of CEMPs for a development to control the treatment and storage of soil.

#### **Environment Act 2021 (November 2021)**

12.6 The Environment Act 2021 received royal ascent in November 2021 and made changes to a series of legislative requirements, including Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Section 40 of the Act, as amended by the Environment Act 2021, establishes a duty that all public authorities operating in England must consider what action they can take to further the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity in England through the

exercise of functions in relation to England. This can include the introduction of planning policies that can seek to conserve protected habitats and species from potentially harmful activity, such as construction and demolition activities.

CEMPs can play an important role in managing construction activities and processes such that their potential to harm the natural environment, either on site or on surrounding sites, can be mitigated.

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

12.7 Various consultees expressed support for policy requirements in relation to construction management and CEMPs. Some respondents highlighted that CEMPs should include how the sourcing and transportation of materials from construction will be managed to limit the carbon emissions from construction activity. Others highlighted that construction activity should prioritise on-site material reuse, which could be controlled as part of submission documents such as CEMPs. Others stated that policy should be clear on the stage in the planning process when CEMPs are required.

## **New or updated evidence base**

12.8 No new or updated evidence.

## **Draft policy and reasons**

12.9 The draft policy can be viewed in the Draft Local Plan.

12.10 Sustainable development needs to be considered during the physical construction and delivery of places, as well as during their use. It should take account of the resources used during the construction, lowering the consumption of resources where possible, and controls the environmental, social and economic impacts of the construction process itself.

12.11 Under legislative changes made by the Environment Act 2021, the councils have a legal duty to identify ways in which the natural environment and natural assets can be protected to further national objectives for nature regeneration. Although temporary in nature, construction activity can have permanent,

negative impacts on natural environments and communities if it is not managed properly. CEMPs can be effective tools in managing negative impacts arising from construction.

12.12 The [Considerate Constructors Scheme](#) (CCS) is a national initiative established by the construction industry. When developers and contractors register as part of the CCS, they are committing to a Code of Considerate Practice – a set of best-practice standards agreed by actors in the construction industry that can be monitored and enforced by the CCS. Given the NPPF's requirements for planning policies to protect the environment and neighbouring amenity from the negative effects of development, it is considered reasonable for developers and contractors to register as part of the CCS (and demonstrate their commitment as part of a CEMP) in cases where development could have significant negative impacts.

12.13 The Councils' approach to construction management and CEMPs is intended as a broad continuation of Policy CC/6 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018). Existing guidance on sustainable construction provided within the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020) will also be read in conjunction with this policy.

### **Additional alternative approaches considered**

12.14 No policy and rely on national policy and the [Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan](#) 2021. This was not considered a reasonable alternative as the NPPF and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan do not explicitly address various issues related to construction management or construction waste, such as soil management or temporary haulage roads.

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

12.15 The councils acknowledge the support received in relation to the introduction of CEMP requirements as part of the Local Plan. The councils have sought to ensure that the details expected as part of CEMPs are made clear to applicants

within the policy and supporting text. Requirements have been included for temporary haulage roads and material storage to ensure that trips to/from sites during construction are limited to only what is required.

- 12.16 With regards material reuse during construction, construction management requirements will be read in conjunction with the Local Plan's approach to the circular economy, material reuse and sustainable waste management (Policy CC/CE). In addition to details on the secure storage of construction materials to limit waste from contamination or loss due to theft, reference has also been made to DEFRA's [Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites](#) to safeguard against the need for unnecessary soil waste and imports. Further detail, including where to view the full representations and who made each representation, is provided in the Consultation Statement.

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

- 12.17 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.