

# Development Strategy

## Topic Paper

Appendix 4: Revised Greater Cambridge Local Plan Green Belt considerations review



### Greater Cambridge Local Plan

Topic Paper published as part of the Proposed Submission Local Plan - Regulation 19 consultation (August 2026 - September 2026)



# Development Strategy Topic Paper 2026 Appendix 4: Revised Greater Cambridge Local Plan Green Belt considerations review (2026)

## Introduction

1.1 For the First Proposals consultation (2021), the Green Belt considerations review (Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Development Strategy Topic Paper (2021), Appendix 1D) supported the assessment of sites considered as part of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan process that are currently located within the Green Belt. Allocating them for development within the Plan would require justification of exceptional circumstances for amending the Green Belt boundaries, as set out in national policy.

1.2 The Review included two sections:

- Exceptional circumstances review: Greater Cambridge-wide exploration
- Report of national planning policy steps followed to support a conclusion of exceptional circumstances

1.3 This Green Belt considerations review (2026) updates the position as of this Regulation 19 Proposed Submission stage. It should be read in conjunction with the Green Belt considerations review published in 2021 and supersedes the 2025 version of the review, published to support the Reg 18..

1.4 In line with the previous approach, this review considers the case for exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt, including the accounting for the following changes since the First Proposals consultation 2021:

- changes to Green Belt policy set out within the updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in December 2024, and supplemented by Planning Practice Guidance in March 2025
- new caselaw relevant to assessing exceptional circumstances

- the updated need for new homes and jobs identified at the Draft Plan stage
- new information submitted to the plan relating to sites proposed for development in the Green Belt (including new sites submitted and updated information relating to sites previously submitted).

## Approach to Green Belt review

### Updated national policy context

1.5 Since the First Proposals 2021 consultation, the following changes have been made to national Green Belt policy in the National Planning Policy Framework:

- Strengthened requirement to review Green Belt boundaries ‘where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes, commercial or other development through other means’. In such cases, ‘authorities should review Green Belt boundaries...and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless...[it]...would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt, when considered across the area of the plan’ [Paragraph 146].
- When Green Belt is to be released [Paragraph 148]:
  - First, plans should give priority to previously developed (brownfield) land in the Green Belt; and
  - Then, plans should consider grey belt which is not previously developed; and
  - Then, plans should consider other Green Belt locations
  - But must consider how plan would promote sustainable patterns of development, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the Framework.
    - 110. 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. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.

- **115.** In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:
  - (a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location;
  - (d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach.

1.6 The NPPF Glossary defines grey belt, referenced above, as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of the following Green Belt purposes set out in paragraph 143:

A: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas  
B: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

D: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

1.7 The Glossary also identifies that 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development.

1.8 Planning Practice Guidance was updated in March 2025 to guide consideration of Grey Belt as referenced in the NPPF above.

## **Approach responding to updated national policy context**

1.9 While the above changes to national planning policy for Green Belt are significant, the following core national Green Belt principles remain unchanged since the First Proposals:

- that government attaches great importance to Green Belts (NPPF 142)
- that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified through the preparation or updating of plans (NPPF 145).
- That before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development (NPPF 147).

1.10 The introduction of Grey Belt as set out in NPPF paragraph 148 does not alter the nature of the planning judgement involved in weighing up the evidence and justification for exceptional circumstances (see below under legal framework), but would be a factor in prioritising areas for potential release should overarching exceptional circumstances exist for changes to the Green Belt boundaries, for example, to meet needs if these cannot be met elsewhere. As such, the starting point for this review is exploring the case for exceptional circumstances, to determine whether NPPF paragraph 146 referred to above applies to the Greater Cambridge Local Plan, before considering whether a site could be identified as grey belt.

1.11 Drawing on the above, this review maintains the overall approach to examining the case for exceptional circumstances set out below under Updated legal framework, incorporating the findings from the Green Belt Study Update within test iv - The nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed).

## **Caselaw supporting exceptional circumstances assessment**

1.12 In the Green Belt Considerations Review undertaken for the First Proposals (2021), the existence of exceptional circumstances was considered based on caselaw in *Calverton Parish Council v Greater Nottingham Councils* (2015).

1.13 The *Calverton* case set out a number of matters or 'tests' that provide a framework to ascertain whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify releasing land from the Green Belt, namely:

- i. The acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- ii. The inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- iii. (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- iv. The nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and
- v. The extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent.

1.14 Since the First Proposals, a further case law example *Keep Bourne End Green v Buckinghamshire Council & Anor* [2020] EWHC 1984 (Admin) (23 July 2020) (bailii.org), has added to understanding of appropriate ways of considering

the case for exceptional circumstances, including the following points:

- Exceptional circumstances is a matter of planning judgement that may comprise one or more factors - Whether a factor is *capable* of being an exceptional circumstance may be a matter of law, as an issue of legal relevance. But whether it amounts to such a circumstance in any given case is a matter of planning judgment.
- Calverton provides an "ideal" structure for considering exceptional circumstances but is not the only approach to take - a more discursive, or open-textured approach would suffice

1.15 Drawing on the above, to ensure consistency through the plan-making process, the below approach to considering exceptional circumstances continues to use the Calverton tests set out above.

1.16 On an additional point, while both Calverton and Keep Bourne End predate the 2024/2025 updates to national planning policy and guidance discussed above, the Councils consider that those updates do not affect the in principle

1.17 nature of exceptional circumstances, and as such do not affect the validity of the principles identified in these legal cases.

## **Assessment of case for exceptional circumstances Calverton tests at a Greater Cambridge-wide level**

**The acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);**

2.1 For homes, the objectively assessed need of 2,289 homes per year (considering Greater Cambridge as one area), or 48,069 homes over a 21 year period, is in excess of the current adopted annual target of 1,675 homes per year. It represents a 35% increase on the average level of annual completions over the period 2011/12 to 2024/25 of 1,696 homes as calculated using the data on historic completions in the [Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Housing](#)

[Land Supply Report \(April 2026\)](#).

2.2 In 2025, AECOM in the Housing Delivery Study for Greater Cambridge: Further Addendum (2025) considered the objectively assessed need of 2,295 homes per year, which was 6 homes a year more than the current objectively assessed need, or 126 homes a year more within the plan period. Given that the change is marginal, we have not asked AECOM to reconsider this, and therefore the following conclusions are from the Addendum (2025).

2.3 AECOM noted in the Addendum (2025) that there has been a reduction in housing market activity nationally since 2020/21 due to challenging market conditions, and that the overall fall in annual completions was almost entirely due to a drop in new-build completions. Additionally, the number of housing starts on site continued to lag behind the volume of permissions granted. However, AECOM considered that this recent fall in annual housing completions was a short-term impact within Greater Cambridge and will not be a permanent reduction over the plan period as planning reforms and interventions from the Government are aimed at restoring confidence and certainty to the development industry and the Councils have taken this slow-down into account in their housing trajectory for the Local Plan.

2.4 In relation to the emerging housing requirement (local housing need calculated using the standard method), the Addendum (2025) confirmed that the housing requirement is achievable and deliverable with either of the spatial options tested. The two spatial options were both considered to be realistic and deliverable by AECOM as they bring forward a blended supply of sites that would 'top up' existing commitments in the mid-latter part of the plan period to meet the housing requirement.

2.5 Within their the Addendum (2025), AECOM also confirmed that the housing trajectory for the draft Local Plan shows sustained delivery throughout the plan period.

2.6 The Greater Cambridge Housing Needs of Specific Groups (Iceni Projects, 2025)

sets out the net need for affordable housing, with the overall local housing need calculated using the standard method (as at June 2025, noting that the standard method outcome that is up to date as at June 2026 is very similar). The update concludes that there is a net need for 928 affordable dwellings per annum in Cambridge and 708 affordable dwellings per annum in South Cambridgeshire. The update outlines that the relationship between affordable housing need and overall housing need is complex, and therefore that the two assessments should not be arithmetically linked. However, the analysis identifies an acute need for affordable housing, and the update recommends that affordable housing delivery should be maximised where opportunities arise, but that ultimately the amount of affordable housing delivered will be limited to the amount that can viably be provided.

2.7 Taking into account existing supply, to meet the identified housing need the number of new homes needing to be delivered through new allocations between 2024 and 2045 is 9,691. In comparison, the adopted Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 found new sites for 8,316 homes of all kinds.

2.8 Taking the above aspects of housing need together, it is considered that the overall objectively assessed need for homes is moderately acute. The need for affordable housing is very acute.

2.9 For jobs, the significant supply of employment land for office and laboratory space means that in quantitative terms there is not a very substantial need for additional land to be found in the new Plan. There is a substantial need for additional industrial and warehousing. Taken together, with respect to all jobs therefore it is not considered that the objectively assessed need is acute.

**The inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;**

2.10 The inherent constraints on supply/availability of land within Greater Cambridge which is prima facie suitable for sustainable development is very low. Including the Sites information update 2025, over 1000 sites have been

assessed through the HELAA, coming through Call for Sites and a desk top review of other sources of supply.

2.11 Drawing on the findings of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (2026), over 250 sites comprising over 9,000 hectares of land were considered to be potential reasonable alternatives for consideration as allocations and for sustainability appraisal.

2.12 We consider that a development strategy focused on the sites outside the Green Belt located on public transport corridors, in particular around Cambourne and at a new settlement adjacent to A11 and A1307 south of Cambridge, is likely to provide an appropriate and sustainable alternative to locating development on the edge of Cambridge within the Green Belt.

2.13 Various evidence base studies, including the sustainability appraisal, have supported the identification and assessment of the different spatial options, including comparing the relative sustainability performance of a strategy focused on Green Belt around the Edge of Cambridge against other alternatives. Strategic spatial options identified (see Strategy topic paper Appendix 1) include those previously identified in 2020 and 2021 to support the First Proposals consultation (2021), 2025 draft plan options, and revised options at Proposed Submission.

2.14 The findings of these studies suggest that in transport terms, the preferred option development strategy performs well in comparison to other options. See the main body of the draft plan Strategy Topic Paper for more details.

2.15 Furthermore, the preferred option development strategy meets our identified need for development such that NPPF paragraph 146 is not relevant to the Proposed Submission Plan.

**(on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;**

2.16 Drawing on the above, while the acuteness of housing need is moderate, the inherent constraints on the supply of land within Greater Cambridge is very low

and as such it is considered that in relation to meeting objectively assessed needs for jobs and homes, sustainable development is likely to be achieved in principle without impinging on the Green Belt.

**The nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed)**

2.17 Further to the above the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment (2021), as supplemented by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review following changes to National Policy and Guidance (2026), has shown that any release of Green Belt would result in harm. The study splits the Green Belt into parcels and provides an assessment of the contribution of each parcel to the Cambridge Green Belt purposes and the degree of harm if it was to be released for development.

**The extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent**

2.18 This is a site-specific test, not applicable to consideration of exceptional circumstances at a Greater Cambridge level.

## **Conclusion**

2.19 Drawing on the assessment, it is considered that on the basis of the Calverton tests, our objectively assessed needs for homes and jobs would not justify a strategic exceptional circumstances case for releasing land in the Cambridge Green Belt for development. On this basis, NPPF paragraph 146 does not apply, as the Councils consider that they can meet the identified need for homes, commercial or other development through means other than the Green Belt.

## **Consideration of grey belt**

2.20 The Councils have completed an update to our 2021 Green Belt Study

(Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review following changes to National Policy and Guidance (2026)) to respond to recently introduced NPPF grey belt policy and subsequent relevant PPG updates. The study sets out the detailed methodology and assessment of Cambridge Green Belt parcels to identify what is considered to be grey belt.

2.21 During the draft Local Plan consultation (December 2025 – January 2026), 60 sites promoted for allocation as part of the Local Plan were accompanied by comments stating the site should be considered grey belt under the definitions set out in the NPPF (December, 2024). These sites have been compared against the grey belt maps prepared through the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review to determine the extent of overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the study (see Annex 1).

2.22 Noting the lack of a strategic exceptional circumstances case for Green Belt review based on NPPF paragraph 146, further in-depth consideration of areas that could provisionally be considered grey belt has not been undertaken at this time.

## **Consideration of site-specific arguments for exceptional circumstances**

2.23 Noting the Councils' position in relation to a strategic-exceptional-circumstances case for the plan as a whole, we have considered site-specific arguments for exceptional circumstances proposed across the area, including: on the edge of Cambridge noting the in principle sustainability merits of locating development in this spatial option; and sites elsewhere in the Green Belt.

2.24 At each plan-making stage we have taken the following consistent approach to addressing exceptional circumstances arguments for site proposals within the Green Belt:

- sites proposed within the Green Belt that do not seek to justify exceptional circumstances – given our conclusions to the previous section of this review we have not reviewed these sites in detail

- sites seeking to justify exceptional circumstances on the basis of high jobs and housing need and the sustainability benefits of locating development on the edge of Cambridge – given our conclusions to the previous section of this review we do not support this argument.
- sites providing bespoke economic arguments for exceptional circumstances: these arguments are considered and responded to within Appendix 9.

2.25 As set out in the main body of the Strategy Topic Paper, on the edge of Cambridge, at First Proposals, Draft Plan and Proposed Submission stages only the Cambridge Biomedical Campus was identified as potentially being able to demonstrate such exceptional circumstances reflecting its significance to the life-science key sector and to the national economy. This individual case for exceptional circumstances is explored in the Draft Plan and Proposed Submission Sites Topic Papers.

2.26 Beyond sites submitted to the Local Plan process in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, other sites were submitted within or on the outer edge of the Green Belt. At Draft Plan and Proposed Submission stages only Babraham Research Campus was identified as potentially being able to demonstrate such exceptional circumstances, reflecting its unique employment characteristics. This individual case for exceptional circumstances is explored in the Draft Plan and Proposed Submission Sites Topic Papers.

## **Report of national planning policy steps followed to support a conclusion of exceptional circumstances**

### **Introduction**

3.1 While the Councils have not identified any strategic exceptional circumstances for general amendments to the Green Belt boundaries (in line with NPPF paragraph 146 or the Calverton tests), site-specific exceptional circumstances have been identified for amendments to the Green Belt boundaries at Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Babraham Research Campus.

3.2 NPPF paragraph 147 sets out the steps that should be followed to inform a decision about whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries. These steps include considering whether the strategy:

- makes as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land;
- optimises the density of development in line with the policies in chapter 11 of this Framework, including whether policies promote a significant uplift in minimum density standards in town and city centres and other locations well served by public transport; and
- has been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development, as demonstrated through the statement of common ground.

3.3 These considerations are, implicitly, most relevant when considering if there are strategic exceptional circumstances to justify a broader review of Green Belt boundaries, for example to meet needs, and appear less relevant to the case for exceptional circumstances in Greater Cambridge which are linked to site specific circumstances and unique economic factors at Cambridge Biomedical Campus and the Babraham Research Campus. Notwithstanding this, reflecting that consistency with NPPF paragraph 147 must be demonstrated before concluding that any exceptional circumstances exist, this section reports on activity by the Councils relating to these steps. It considers each aspect in turn in relation to the Proposed Submission development strategy.

3.4 This section considers each aspect in turn in relation to the Preferred Option development strategy, in order to help support justification for removing land from the Green Belt.

## Analysis

### **Does the strategy make as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land?**

3.5 Yes, the strategy in the proposed submission plan is not materially different in this regard to the strategy included at draft plan and first proposals stages and, therefore, the findings at the previous plan-making stage remain relevant.

3.6 The strategy seeks to maximise development within Cambridge urban area and on the edge of Cambridge on brownfield land, including at Cambridge East in particular, as well as at smaller sites within Cambridge, and by encouraging redevelopment of Cambridge urban area locations via policy areas, where there is less certainty of delivery.

3.7 It also includes allocations at new settlements that have planning permission at Northstowe, land north of Waterbeach and at Bourn Airfield which all provide opportunities to make use of significant areas of previously developed land.

### **Does the strategy optimise the density of development in line with the policies in chapter 11 of this Framework, including whether policies promote a significant uplift in minimum density standards in town and city centres and other locations well served by public transport?**

3.8 Yes. All proposed allocations have been subject to detailed capacity testing to optimise the density of development, maximising the potential of urban locations and others well served by public transport, whilst reflecting contextual factors such as sensitive landscapes, local townscape character and historic assets. Examples of such locations where we are proposing higher densities include Eddington, Clifton Road / Cambridge Junction, North West Cambridge and Cambridge East.

**Has the strategy been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development, as demonstrated through the statement of common ground?**

3.9 Yes. In our early Duty to Cooperate discussions with our neighbouring authorities we raised the NPPF requirement to discuss this issue if we were to explore Green Belt release. Further to this, as set out in our draft Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance, in June 2021 we sent letters to our neighbouring authorities to ask them whether there were any opportunities in their area that could accommodate any of the housing need identified in Greater Cambridge, and if so where those were. No authorities replied affirmatively to this question. In advance of the draft plan consultation we repeated this exercise; again no authorities replied affirmatively to this question.

## **Conclusion**

3.10 We consider that we have addressed the steps in NPPF paragraph 147 which need to be followed before concluding whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries.

## **Summary of Green Belt considerations**

4.1 Drawing on the assessment, it is considered that on the basis of the Calverton tests, our objectively assessed needs for homes and jobs would not justify a strategic exceptional circumstances case for releasing land in the Cambridge Green Belt for development. On this basis, the preferred option development strategy meets our identified need for development such that NPPF paragraph 146 is not relevant to the emerging plan. As there are no strategic exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release, the Councils have not considered grey belt land although we have carried out an assessment to identify land that could provisionally be considered grey belt, in line with NPPF requirements.

4.2 Notwithstanding the conclusions at the plan level, consideration of site specific arguments for exceptional circumstances resulted in the identification of two

sites potentially being able to demonstrate exceptional circumstances for Green Belt boundary amendments: Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Babraham Research Campus. Their cases are explored further in the Sites Topic Paper.

4.3 We consider that we have addressed the steps in NPPF paragraph 147 which need to be followed before concluding whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries. Drawing on the considerations above, this enables us to confirm our position regarding the case for exceptional circumstances at the sites referred to above.

## Annex 1: Draft Local Plan Consultation Site Submissions featuring Grey Belt Comments

1. The site submissions listed below, which featured comments stating the site should be considered grey belt land, have been compared against the grey belt maps provided in the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review following changes to national planning policy and planning practice guidance. Please note, the list below only considers the sites stated to be grey belt by promoters during the Draft Local Plan consultation (December 2025 – January 2026). For the Councils' response to grey belt matters raised at earlier stages of plan making and response to comments that challenged the findings of the GCGBA, please refer to the GCGBA Response to Comments from Site Submissions Update and Draft Local Plan Consultation (2026) prepared by LUC.

### **40048: Land at South Trumpington**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

### **40058b: North of Wort's Causeway and West of Limekiln Road, Cherry Hinton, Cambridge. CB1 8PU**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

### **40079: Land at Silverdale Close, Coton**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: CT12.

### **40096: Land North of A14 and south of Milton Road, Impington**

Peripheral Grey Belt. Using the output of the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026), minor areas of grey belt on the site's edges, but the site is largely not identified as grey belt.

### **40152: Land south of West Street and west of South Street, Comberton**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

### **40192: Land east of Glebe Way (adjacent to Histon and Impington Park Primary)**

Partially Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: HI5.

### **40232: Land West of South Road**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

### **40236: Land north of Villa Road**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: HI21.

**40241: Land east of Redgate, Girton**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**40250: Land East of Gazelle Way**

Partially Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: TE9.

**40261: Land at Branch Road and Long Road, Comberton**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**40271: Land east of Balsham Road, Fulbourn**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: FU12; FU13.

**40282: Land adjacent to St George's Way and Woodcock Close Impington**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: HI12.

**40295: Land at Fulbourn Road, Teversham**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**40296: Land to the south of Oakington Road, Cottenham**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: CH10.

**40303: Land south of Station Road, Harston**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**40310: Land to the west of South Street Comberton**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: CO10.

**40341: Land to the north of Mill Lane, Sawston**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: SA20; SA21.

**40361: Land off High Street, Landbeach**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: LA8.

**40365: Land off Butt Lane, Milton**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: MI1B.

**40372: Land to the north of Glebe Road, Waterbeach**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: WA14.

**40392: Land off Ambrose Way, Impington**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: HI8.

**40408: Land to the south-east of Cambridge Road, Foxton**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: FX2.

**40412: Land to the north and east of Barrington Road, Foxton**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: FX2.

**40414: Land east of Cambridge Road**

Partially Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: HA5.

**40466: Land south of Bannold Road, Waterbeach**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: WA1; WA2.

**40501: Land East of Bush Close, Comberton**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: CO6.

**40509: Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c, Sawston**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**40555: Cockerton Road, Girton**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: GI13.

**48095: Land at Beach Road, Cottenham**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: CH1; CH2.

**51608: Scotland Farm, Dry Drayton**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**51610: Land off Shelford Road, Fulbourn**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**52643: Land north of Barton Road and Land at Grange Farm, Cambridge**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**52694: Fosters Field, Hill Farm Road, Whittlesford, Cambridge**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**52726: Land Rear of 1 Wren Park, Whittlesford, CB22 4LY**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**52761: Land north of Wilbraham Road, Fulbourn**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt

Assessment Review (2026).

**54906: Land at Rectory Farm, to the North-West of Milton**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**56211: Land at Long View Farm, 75 Denny End Road, Waterbeach**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: WA14.

**59397: Land to the west of Duxford Road, Whittlesford**

Partially Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: WH12; WH13.

**59410: The Boundary, High Street, Horningsea**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: HO4.

**200751: Dernford Reservoir, Dernford Lane, Stapleford**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**200756: Land At Fleam End Farm, High Ditch Road, Fen Ditton**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: FD7.

**200759: Land at Girton Road, Girton**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**200768: Land south of High Street, Hauxton**

Partially Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: HX7.

**200770: Land to east of Horningsea Road & west of Ditton Lane, Fen Ditton**

Partially Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: FD3.

**200771: North of Mingle Lane and East of Hinton Way, Stapleford, Cambridgeshire**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: GS9.

**200772: Barn 3, Park Farm, Villa Road, Impington**

Peripheral Grey Belt. Using the output of the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026), minor areas of grey belt on the site's edges, but the site is largely not identified as grey belt.

**200783: Land to the north of A505, Duxford**

Partially Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: HE2; HE3.

**200790: Land to the south of Peterhouse Technology Park, Cherry Hinton, Cambridge. CB1 9NJ**

Peripheral Grey Belt. Using the output of the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026), minor areas of grey belt on the site's edges, but the site is largely not

identified as grey belt.

**200795: Land to the south of allocation E/3 and to the rear of Westbourn Farm, Cambridge. CB1 9NJ**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**200829: Land East of Bridge Road, Impington**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**208800: Rectory Farm, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB23 7PG**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**208850: Land North of Long Road, Cambridge, CB2 8HH**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**208851: NIAB Park Farm, Villa Rd, Histon**

Peripheral Grey Belt. Using the output of the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026), minor areas of grey belt on the site's edges, but the site is largely not identified as grey belt.

**208854: Quy Tech, Land to the north of the A14, Stow cum Quy. CB239AF**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**208861: Land at Bury Farm, Haverhill Road, Stapleford, CB22 5BP**

Partially Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: GS13.

**208871: Evolution Business Park, Milton Road, CB24 9NG**

No overlap with grey belt parcels identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review (2026).

**209526: Land at Mingle Lane, Great Shelford**

Wholly Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: GS9.

**209527: Land south of Branch Road, Comberton, CB23 7BF**

Partially Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: CO2; CO3.

**OS214: Cambridge South (Cambridge Biomedical Centre) - West**

Partially Grey Belt. Overlaps with the following grey belt parcel(s) identified by the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Review: GS25.